

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES
(*Survey Methodology* #2012-08)

**Observing Census Enumeration of Non-English
Speaking Households in the 2010 Census:
Chinese Report**

Robert Shepherd¹
Yuling Pan
Stephen Lubkemann

¹ George Washington University

Center for Survey Measurement
Research and Methodology Directorate
U.S. Census Bureau
Washington, D.C. 20233

Report Issued: November 29, 2012

Disclaimer: This report is released to inform interested parties of research and to encourage discussion. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

Abstract

This study was part of an ethnographic research project in the 2010 Census Assessment and Research Program to observe the 2010 Census Nonresponse Followup (NRFU) interviews with households that speak a language other than English, in areas of the U.S. with heavy concentrations of residents with limited English proficiency. A multilingual research team consisting of seven sub-teams in the seven primary languages (Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Vietnamese) was commissioned to carry out the research in the 2010 Census.

The objectives of this research were to identify: (1) how language and socio-cultural factors affect the enumeration of non-English-speaking populations during the Nonresponse Followup interview process; (2) what measures were taken by enumerators to negotiate and maintain access to non-English-speaking households and to collect the required census data from these households; (3) how in-language census materials were used in the field; (4) how non-English-speaking immigrant populations perceived and reacted to the census and its public messaging; and (5) what changes, if any, are needed to improve the enumeration process with households that have limited or no English proficiency. Findings from this study will help develop recommendations for planning the 2020 Census, including the Decennial Language Program, questionnaire development, translation of census questions, use of interpreters in enumeration interviews, and interviewer training.

This report presents findings from the Chinese research team of bilingual ethnographers who studied the Chinese community to highlight the issues observed in the research. While the findings clearly draw attention to the importance of linguistic competency among NRFU enumerators, they also demonstrate that we need more than linguistic competency, language aids, and minority language media campaigns in order to increase successful census participation among linguistic minorities. The negotiation of interview access, effective communication about the census' objectives, the translation of concepts that do not carry conceptual equivalence, the ability to successfully sustain the interview as a communicative event, and ultimately the ability to elicit the information that the census is designed to obtain—are all demonstrated to require robust understandings of the highly differentiated social and cultural contexts of particular immigrant communities. Drawing on findings from the ethnographic study, the report suggests recommendations for planning the 2020 Census.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	5
1.1	Rationale and Objectives.....	5
2	Community Background: Chinese Speakers in the United States	6
3	Methods.....	9
3.1	Fieldwork Overview.....	9
3.2	Fieldwork Challenges	15
4	Findings.....	22
4.1	Understandings of the Census.....	22
4.2	The NRFU Interview	25
5	Enumerator Views of Cultural Issues	29
6	Recommendations	34
6.1	A Ten-Year Outlook for the Chinese American Community	34
6.2	Specific Recommendations for 2020 Decennial Census	35
7	Future Research Directions	36
8	References.....	38
9	Appendix A: Chinese Enumerator Interactions with Non-Chinese Speakers	41
10	Appendix B: ENUMERATOR NRFU QUESTIONNAIRE	44
11	Appendix C: RESPONDENT DEBRIEFING QUESTIONS.....	48
12	Appendix D: Enumerator Debriefing Questions	52

1 Introduction

1.1 Rationale and Objectives

In 2010, the Census Bureau undertook the decennial census to enumerate the U.S. population, with a mission of counting everyone once, only once, and in the right place. Accurate enumeration of households in which no one 14 and over speaks English only or speaks a language other than English at home and speaks English “very well” in decennial censuses represents an enormous challenge for the Census Bureau. To meet this challenge, the Census Bureau developed a comprehensive language assistance program, which includes the 2010 Census fulfillment form in the five primary non-English languages (Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Russian, and Vietnamese), language assistance guides in 59 languages, and telephone questionnaire assistance in the top five non-English languages. Yet, as of the time of the 2010 decennial census the Census Bureau still lacked an adequate understanding of how linguistic isolation influenced the census data collection process amongst non-English-speaking households. Since many such households seemed unlikely to respond to the English mail out and mail back census questionnaires, it remained likely that the data they would provide would be obtained through face-to-face interviews. Consequently, a comparative study was designed to ethnographically observe Nonresponse Followup (NRFU) interviews amongst eight different communities of language to identify what, if any, social and linguistic factors were affecting the reliability and validity of the NRFU data collected from households in which no one 14 and over speaks English only or speaks a language other than English at home and speaks English “very well.”

This report focuses on the findings from the observational study of census enumeration conducted amongst Chinese-speaking households. Our overarching objective was to assess the extent to which the NRFU interview process obtained valid and satisfactory responses from respondents who were primarily or solely Chinese speakers, and to assess social, cultural and linguistic factors that created barriers or otherwise mediated that goal. Our observations and analysis were guided by three broad questions that were the focus of all ethnographic teams in the broader comparative study, namely:

- How did the linguistic background of respondents whose sole or primary language was not English (but in this case was Chinese) affect their interaction with enumerators and their participation in the NRFU interview?
- What social and cultural factors affected interaction between enumerators and respondents and with what effect upon the communicative process?
- How was the challenge of translation addressed, and more specifically, what role did interpreters play, how were they recruited, and what effect did they have upon the communicative process?

Our findings in this report focus on the first two of these questions because we observed relatively few situations in which interpreters were used, and no instances in which they were used in situations involving native Chinese speakers.

Following a brief overview of the history and community of Chinese-speakers in the United States, this report describes the specific methods employed in this field study and the challenges that qualify our observations and analysis. This is followed by a discussion of our findings and finally by recommendations for improving future NRFU coverage amongst Chinese-speakers.

2 Community Background: Chinese Speakers in the United States

The Chinese population in the United States has changed in terms of origins and size in the last three decades, as the number of residents born in mainland China has increased, the Taiwan-born population aged, and the Hong Kong-born population leveled out. Drawing from data gathered from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2000 Decennial Census, 2006 American Community Survey (ACS), and the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Immigration Statistics (OIS) for 2006, 2007, and 2008, the Migration Policy Institute estimates that as of 2008 there were 1.356 million legal mainland China-born residents in the United States, largely clustered in New York and California (Terrazas & Batalova, 2010). As late as 1982, there were just 56,930 *total* emigrants in the entire world from the People's Republic of China. The contrast between these two numbers provides a sense of how new this demographic group is in the United States and how quickly it is growing (Liang & Marooka, 2004, p. 148).

By 2008 mainland born (including Hong Kong-born) residents constituted approximately 45% of the 3.2 million members of the broader Chinese Diaspora in the United States, and were a larger population than the total number (38.3%) of native born citizens with Chinese ancestry. Of this total of approximately 1.4 million legal migrants, 32.8% had entered the United States after 1999 and another 30% had entered between 1990 and 1999. In other words, almost two-thirds of these legal residents entered the United States in the last two decades. By 2008, 56.8% of these migrants had taken U.S. citizenship. As of 2008, the overall Chinese-born migrant population constituted the fourth largest number of lawful permanent residents, after Mexicans, Filipinos, and Indians (Rytina 2009).

Liu (2005) categorizes new Chinese immigrants as students-turned-immigrants, professionals, chain migrants, and undocumented immigrants. Terrazas and Batalova (2010) report that as of 2008 45.7 % of adult immigrants from China over the age of 25 possessed a college degree and 24.2% reported working in white collar professions such as management, finance, and information technology. However, approximately one-quarter (25.5%) of mainland Chinese immigrants had not earned a high school degree, and approximately 28% of adults worked in service and sales. This clear class division—in terms of education and occupation—maps loosely onto a geographic division in terms of the areas of mainland China from which these immigrants originate. Liang and Marooka (2004, p.153, 155) conclude that as of 1995 more than 80% of Fujian emigrants had less than a junior high school education and 66% came from rural backgrounds. In contrast, 76% of emigrants from Beijing had a bachelor's degree or higher (Liang & Marooka, 2004, p. 153).

American media reports in the 1990s suggested a widespread problem with undocumented Chinese migrants. Yet relative to other population groups, illegal entry appears to be shrinking.

The Department of Homeland Security estimated that approximately 190,000 Chinese migrants were in the United States illegally in 2000 (Hoefler et al., 2007). However, this total was estimated to have declined to 120,000 by 2009 (Hoefler et al., 2009). In terms of the over-all number of undocumented migrants estimated to reside in the U.S. -- approximately 10.8 million in 2009 (Terrazas & Batalova, 2010) -- undocumented Chinese migrants represent a small minority, despite this widespread publicity in recent years about an alleged “tidal wave” of Chinese migration (Hoefler et al., 2009).

Reasons for this decline are unclear, but no doubt include factors such as stricter U.S. border controls and improved living standards and personal mobility in China. While a household registration system originally designed to limit citizen movement still officially exists in China, strict enforcement has weakened significantly since economic reforms began in 1979 and today most observers agree that a growing number of citizens live outside of their official residency. While 2010 People’s Republic of China (PRC) census data are not yet available, Chan and Zhang (1999) estimated the domestic migrant population as 88-100 million in the late 1990s. Using 2000 PRC census data, Liang and Ma (2004) argues that the actual figure was 145 million, including 79 million people who moved to different counties or provinces for at least six months as well as 66 million who moved within a county (Liang & Ma, 2004, p. 483-484). These statistics suggest that upwards of 10% of the population, now lives “out of place.” A recent Chinese mayor’s association report predicted this number will rise to as many as 300 million in coming decades (Xinhua News Agency, May 30, 2011). The majority of undocumented Chinese immigrants in the United States appear to be from Fujian Province. Contrary to common assumptions, these largely rural, less educated and male migrants are motivated not by stark poverty but instead by a greater awareness of opportunities abroad, often gained through family and village contacts (Skeldon, 2000, p. 17). However, other researchers point out that, although poverty might not be a motivating factor, the increased marginalization of rural citizens since market reforms began in China has also played a key role in driving outmigration. Rural Chinese might have more materially secure lives than previous generations, but they are also more clearly aware of their marginal status relative to privileged urban residents (Liang & Ye, 2001).

The Taiwan-born immigrant population in the United States is significantly smaller, numbering 342,444 as of 2008 (Lin, 2010). This estimate is supported by data from the Republic of China’s (ROC) Overseas Chinese Affairs Commission, which estimated the total Taiwan immigrant population in the United States was 344,000 in 2002. Approximately 44,000 (12%) of this total had been born in China and had moved to Taiwan after the 1945-1949 Chinese civil war (Zhou & Chiang, 2009).¹ In the 2000 U.S. Census, more than 30% of the 300,000 Taiwan-born immigrants chose to identify as “Taiwanese” (Zhou & Chiang, 2009, p. 121).

The main centers of Taiwanese settlement are Southern California, the San Francisco Bay area, and the metropolitan New York City area. The Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, California

¹ Taiwan was incorporated into the Japanese Empire after the first Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895). People who trace their ancestry on the island to before the 1945 return of Taiwan to the Republic of China are commonly referred to as Taiwanese (*benshengren*, ‘native born’) and constitute approximately 85% of the population. People born in China who moved to Taiwan after 1945, along with their descendants, are collectively called *waishengren*, or ‘foreign born’. The indigenous inhabitants of Taiwan (*yuanchumin*) number more than 450,000 (2% of the total population of 23 million), divided into 14 recognized groups and 12 unrecognized groups. Indigenous people are Malayo-Polynesian and speak Austronesian languages.

metropolitan area had the largest number of Taiwanese- born in 2008 (83,294, or 24.3%), followed by New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA (39,617, or 11.6%); San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA (30,562, or 8.9%); and San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA (23,299, or 6.8%). These four metropolitan areas accounted for 51.6% of all Taiwanese immigrants in the United States.

In contrast to mainland immigrants (62.8% of whom immigrated after 1990 and nearly 100% after 1980), less than half of Taiwan-born residents arrived in the United States after 1990. As of 2008, 32.9% of the 342,000 Taiwanese foreign born entered the country between 1980 and 1989, 23.7% entered between 1990 and 1999, 20.5% in 2000 or later, and the remaining 23.0% prior to 1980 (Terrazas & Batalova, 2010). As of 2008, 71.8% of Taiwanese immigrants had assumed American citizenship. Roughly the same percentage had earned a Bachelor's degree or higher, while less than 5% of Taiwanese immigrants had less than a high school education. The likelihood of low levels of English proficiency among Taiwanese immigrants is consequently highly unlikely, given average educational levels, the amount of time most immigrants have spent in the United States and the substantial cultural and political ties between the United States and the Republic of China on Taiwan for the past six decades.

The Taiwanese community is relatively stable economically, with 75.9% of adults reporting they own their home, while less than 12% of households lacked health insurance. Approximately 60% of the adult population is employed in management, finance, information technology, and the medical industry (Terrazas & Batalova, 2010). The undocumented Taiwan-born population in the United States appears to be statistically insignificant. However, the number of Taiwan-born residents who choose to become American citizens has declined significantly in the last decade, from 132,647 (1990-1999) (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2008) to 86,363 during the 2000-2009 period (Terrazas & Batalova, 2010). In contrast, approximately 637,400 mainland-born Chinese were naturalized between 2000 and 2009 (Terrazas & Batalova 2010).

The third major source of Chinese immigration is Hong Kong. Since 1999, Hong Kong-born residents of the United States have been included in American Community Survey (ACS) data and decennial census surveys in the category of Chinese-born residents. As of 2008, there were approximately 210,500 Hong Kong-born immigrants residing in the United States (Terrazas & Batalova, 2010). Immigration from Hong Kong has stabilized in the years since reunification with China in 1999 and is now lower than to other popular immigration destinations. For example, according to 2006 Canadian census data, 215,430 Hong Kong-born residents live in Canada, 29.8% of all ethnic Chinese immigrants (Statistics Canada, 2006).²

In summary, the mainland-China born immigrant legal population is growing while the undocumented population has declined. The percentage of foreign-born residents who identify as Taiwanese has also declined in the last two decades and shows no sign of stopping (short of a catastrophic event such as a military conflict between China and Taiwan). The Taiwanese-born population is more affluent, educated and economically secure than the mainland-born population, yet both groups have large concentrations in three population centers -- greater New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. It is against this background that the current study was carried. This report will summarize findings from the Chinese research team regarding Chinese

² As of 2006, Canada had 466,940 legal mainland-born immigrants and 65,205 Taiwan-born immigrants.

respondents' reaction to and perception of the U.S. Census and their participation (or lack of) in the U.S. Census.

3 Methods

3.1 Fieldwork Overview

Fieldwork took place between May 8th and May 30th, 2010, in the Washington, DC metro area and New York City. These field sites were chosen in part based on previous Census data. The greater New York region has the highest concentration of Chinese-speaking urban residents in the United States and thus necessarily was included in this project. The Virginia and Maryland inner suburbs of the Washington, DC region were selected as a representative sample of a more geographically diverse yet rapidly growing suburban Chinese-speaking population. While in 2000 Maryland had an estimated ethnic Chinese population of just 49,400 and Virginia just 36,900,³ demographic data suggests that both the Chinese population and broader Asian-born population in both states has increased significantly. According to 2009 American Community Survey data, the Chinese population of Montgomery County, Maryland is approximately 35,000, 3.7% of all residents.⁴ In Virginia, the total Asian population has increased 69%, to 440,000 (of approximately 8 million), since 2000. In Fairfax County, Virginia (2010 population 1.015 million), 17.5% of residents identify as Asian-American, and of this number approximately 26,000 (2.5%) are native Chinese speakers (University of Virginia, 2010).⁵

Field observations involved: 1) accompanying Census Bureau enumerators on home visits; 2) short interviews with Nonresponse Followup (NRFU) household members; and 3) summary interviews with enumerators. The research team consisted of a trained ethnographer with five years experience in China and Taiwan and three research assistants. The lead ethnographer speaks standard Mandarin Chinese as a second language, as do two research assistants, both second generation Chinese American graduate students. They each have lived and studied in mainland China for three years; in addition to their Mandarin skills, one understands standard Cantonese while the second is conversant in the Toishan (Taishan) dialect of Cantonese. The third research assistant is a native Chinese speaker from Taiwan who lived for several years in Guangzhou (Canton) and thus speaks Mandarin, Cantonese, and Taiwanese (Min Nan).

Before fieldwork began, team members developed a set of standardized questions for respondent and enumerator debriefings. The respondent set consisted of 14 questions divided into five categories: census experience, perceptions of census use, experience with other surveys, censuses, and/or interviews, census technical issues, and the census interview process as a communicative event. The enumerator debriefing consisted of 10 questions in three categories: the interview experience, interactions with respondents, and the interview process as a

³ U.S. Census Bureau, "Fact Checker," <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>, accessed May 17, 2011.

⁴ U.S. Census Bureau "American Fact Finder", accessed May 26, 2011:

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ADPGeoSearchByListServlet?_lang=en&_ts=324490623639.

⁵ See also U.S. Census Bureau "Fact Finder": http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ADPTable?_bm=y&-context=adp&-qr_name=ACS_2009_1YR_G00_DP5&-ds_name=ACS_2009_1YR_G00_-tree_id=309&-redoLog=true&-caller=geoselect&-geo_id=05000US51059&-format=&-_lang=en, accessed May 26, 2011.

communicative event. Both were first developed and written in English. Each was then translated separately by two team members. The team as a whole then reconciled the two translations, and a third team member translated each back into English to insure accuracy. The final versions were examined by an outside Chinese native speaker for clarity and understandability.

During 19 days of field work, research team members observed 286 NRFU visits, of which there were 72 successful NRFU interviews. Of this total, 22 Chinese speakers and 15 non-Chinese speakers were observed and interviewed. The majority (19 of 22) of observed Chinese speakers spoke Mandarin Chinese as a first language. Following is a summary of these interviews.

Table 1: NRFU Respondent Characteristics

RA/E	Ethnicity & Origins/ <i>Laojia</i> ⁶	Gender	Chinese-Speaking Fluency	Years in US
RA 1⁷				
R #1	Chinese / Shenyang	Male	Mandarin	13
R#2	Chinese / Shaanxi	Male	Mandarin	10
R#3	Chinese / Mainland	Couple (PROXY)	Mandarin	?
R#4	European / Caucasian	Female	None	1
R#5	East European	Female	None	?
R#6	Bengali	Male	None	?
R#7	White	Female	None	N/A
R#8	Indian	Female	None	?
R#9	Chilean	Female	None	?
R#10	White	Female	None	N/A
R#11	White	Female	None	N/A
R#12	Filipina	Female	None	?
R#13	American-Israeli	Couple	None	N/A
R#14	Chinese/ Mainland	Couple	Mandarin	20
RA 2⁸				
R#1	Indian	Female	None	8
R#2	Vietnamese/White American	Female	None	N/A
R#3	White	Female	None	N/A
R#4*	Chinese /	Female	Mandarin	10

⁶ When possible, we sought to identify a Chinese speaker's *laojia* ('native place'), not just their formal citizenship status at birth (i.e. PRC, ROC, or British Crown Colony of Hong Kong).

⁷ R1 conducted fieldwork in Maryland.

⁸ R2 conducted fieldwork in Virginia.

	Mainland			
R#5	White	Female	None	N/A
R#6	White	Female	None	N/A
RA 3^{9 10}				
R#1	Chinese, Shanghai	Couple	Cantonese & Mandarin	31
R#2	Chinese, Henan	Male	Mandarin	13
R#3	Chinese	Female	Mandarin	1
R#4	Chinese	Female	Mandarin	5
R#5	Chinese	Female	Mandarin	10
R#6	Chinese	Male	Mandarin	8
R#7	Chinese, Fujian	Female	Mandarin	1 year, 3 months
R#8	Taiwanese	Male	Mandarin	4 months
R#9	Chinese, Fujian	Male	Mandarin	3
R#10	Chinese	Female	Mandarin	5
TL¹¹				
R#1	Chinese	Male	Mandarin	4
R#2	Chinese-American	Male	Conversational Mandarin	Since birth
R#3	Chinese, Guangzhou	Male	Cantonese & Mandarin	2
R#4	Chinese, Beijing	Female	Mandarin	9
R#5	Chinese	Female	Mandarin	2 months
R#6	Chinese, Anhui	Couple	Mandarin	6
R#7	Chinese, Hong Kong	Female	Cantonese, conversation Mandarin	13

Team members also observed and interviewed 18 enumerators in the field, 12 of whom were Chinese speakers. Of these, six were from China, two from Taiwan, one from Hong Kong, one from Vietnam, and two were American-born Chinese. More specific data on the enumerators and the interviewees with whom they interacted is provided in the table below:

⁹ R3 conducted fieldwork in New York.

¹⁰ None of the interviews by RA 3 were recorded because of local LCO regulations.

¹¹ TL conducted fieldwork in Virginia and Maryland.

Table 2: Enumerator Characteristics

RA/E	Ethnicity & <i>Laojia</i>	Gender	Chinese-Speaking Fluency	# Days Observed	# Cases Observed (approx.)
RA 1					
E #1	Chinese, from Taiwan	Male	Basic Mandarin	1	7
E#2	Chinese, from Taiwan	Male	Conversational Mandarin	2	6
E#3	Chinese, from Xian	Male	Native Speaker, Mandarin	1	6
E#4	Chinese, from Shanghai	Male	Native Speaker, Mandarin	1	4
RA 2					
E #1	White American	Male	None	1	5
E#2	Vietnamese	Female	Conversational Mandarin	3	13
E#3	White American	Female	None	1	6
E#4	Chinese, from Taiwan	Female	Native Speaker, Mandarin	1	4
E#5	White American	Male	None	1	2
E#6	African-American	Female	None	1	3
RA 3					
E #1	Chinese-American	Male	Conversational Cantonese	1	2
E#2	Chinese-American	Male	Native Cantonese Speaker; Fluent Mandarin	1	3
E#3	Chinese	Female	Native Mandarin Speaker	1	6
E#4	Chinese, from Fujian		Native Speaker, Mandarin & Min Nan	1	1
TL					
E #1	Vietnamese ¹²	Female	Conversational	1	3

¹² TL-E#1 is the same enumerator as RA2-E#2.

			Mandarin		
E#2	Chinese-American	Female	Native Cantonese Speaker; Conversational Mandarin	1	2
E#3	Chinese, from Beijing	Female	Native Mandarin Speaker	1	4
E#4	Venezuela	Female	None	1	7
TOTALS				21	84

Finally, in an effort to gain additional perspectives, the lead ethnographer conducted a series of supplementary interviews in the Washington, DC area after NRFU observations and interviews were completed. The purpose of these additional interviews was to learn how Chinese-speakers perceived the census process. He focused on two areas of the local Chinese community that, he theorized, were most likely to be linguistically isolated: a program for senior citizens who had emigrated to the United States relatively late in their lives and young service workers, who were recent arrivals from mainland China.

Working with staff of a Chinese community service organization in the DC metro region, he conducted eight taped interviews with senior citizens in one area office. Volunteers were selected based on availability, and were fully informed of the purpose and nature of this research project. Five interviewees were female, three were male; three had emigrated from mainland China, five from Taiwan. One mainland immigrant has been in the United States for 17 years, but the other two have been here for six years or less. In contrast, all five immigrants from Taiwan have been in the United States for a significant period -- 33, 30, 20, 21, and 14 years, respectively. Only one interviewee (S#6), a retired engineer, could speak English fluently. All eight interviewees had participated in the 2010 Census, either by completing the written form themselves (S#3, S#4, S#6, S#10), completing this with the help of a family member (S#9), or because they lived with one of their children and were counted by them (S#5, S#7, S#8). Significantly, all reported either having seen television commercials or newspaper advertisements for this year's census. They also all reported hearing information about the census process and purpose when attending various activities at their community center.

Table 3: Demographic Profile of Interviewees

Type Number	Gender	Previous Residency	Chinese Dialect	Years In USA	Birthplace/ <i>Laojia</i>
S#3	Female	China	Mandarin, Sichuanese	17	Chongqing, China
S#4	Female	Taiwan	Mandarin	32	Beijing, China
S#5	Female	Taiwan	Mandarin	23	Nanjing,

					China
S#6	Male	Taiwan	Mandarin, Taiwanese	21	Henan, China
S#7	Female	Taiwan	Mandarin, Taiwanese	14	Qingdao, China
S#8	Female	China	Mandarin	6	Shanghai, China
S#9	Male	China	Mandarin	5	Shandong, China
S#10	Male	Taiwan	Mandarin	33	China

The team leader also conducted 13 informal oral interviews and one taped interview with Chinese restaurant workers at five different locations in Virginia. He decided to conduct informal interviews after failing to receive permission from restaurant managers to conduct formal taped interviews with workers at two different locations. While a customer at each of these five locations, he explained to servers his occupation as a university professor, his work with the U.S. Census Bureau, and the objectives of this project. He also stressed that all identifying information would be confidential. In addition to obtaining basic information on origin, linguistic competency, and length of residence in the U.S., open-ended questions were asked about participation in, and awareness of, the census and its objectives.

Nine of these respondents were from Fujian Province, three were from the Northeast region of China, and one was from Beijing. Ten were female, three male; the age range was between 19 and 27. No one reported being in the United States more than five years. Three respondents had finished high school, the others junior high. Most significantly, eight stated they had not participated in the 2010 Census, three were not sure, and two stated either they “might have” or “possibly had” [可能, *keneng*]. In terms of awareness, only two said they had seen advertisements about the Census, while the rest either did not know or were not sure. This is understandable, given the realities of working hours in many Chinese buffet-style restaurants.

Finally, two owners of a small Chinese take-out restaurant were also interviewed. This couple emigrated from Fujian in 1999 (S#1 & 2). Although they had not participated in the 2000 Census, they had completed the written form for this year’s census with the help of their 13-year-old son, who came to the United States three years ago after they had resolved their immigration status. While they reported not seeing advertisements or commercials about the census, this is understandable since they work from 10 a.m. until midnight seven days a week.

Table 4: Demographic Profile of Supplementary Interviewees

Respondent	Gender	Birthplace/ <i>Laojia</i>	Age	Census Participation	Census Awareness
R#1	Female	Changchun, Jilin	23	No	No
R#2	Female	Beijing	19	Not sure	Yes
R#3	Female	Shenyang, Liaoning	22	No	No
R#4	Female	Fujian	24	No	Not sure
R#5	Male	Fujian	22	No	No
R#6	Female	Fujian	24	Not sure	Yes
R#7	Female	Fujian	20	No	No
R#8	Female	“Northeast”	26	No	No
R#9	Female	Fujian	20	Not sure	No
R#10	Female	Fujian	23	No	No
R#11	Male	Fujian	21	Might have	Not sure
R#12	Male	Fujian	20	Might have	Not sure
R#13	Female	Fujian	21	No	No

3.2 Fieldwork Challenges

3.2.1 Locating Subjects: Where ARE the Chinese-Speakers?

One of the most significant challenges we encountered in our research -- and one mirrored in the NRFU enumeration itself -- was simply that of locating Chinese-speaking respondents. Our efforts to observe in-the-field interactions between Census enumerators and Chinese-speaking respondents necessarily depended to some extent on relying on the capacity of LCOs to direct our teams to predominantly Chinese populated areas. The extent to which different LCOs proved capable of doing this was highly variable.

Thus, for example our one team member who worked in a New York LCO area encountered almost exclusively Chinese respondents. This was largely attributable to the actions of the LCO assistant manager, who “pulled” specific cases for him to observe in which Chinese-speaking residents had requested a Chinese-speaking enumerator. However, in the other areas in which we undertook NRFU observations, LCOs tended to rely on general demographic indicators that produced far less satisfactory results. Thus for example, in a full day of field work in one area in Virginia one fieldworker encountered no Chinese respondents, despite the fact that LCO administrators estimated that this area has a 12% Chinese-speaking population. Of course, the

reasons for this might include factors such as bad luck, a high paper response rate by Chinese-speakers, the time of day or the day of the week.

In the case of Chinese speakers one important factor that may have affected results is that there appears to be less of a tendency for Chinese-speakers to constitute geographically contiguous “ethnic enclaves” outside of the core settlement areas of Los Angeles, San Francisco, and New York (see recommendations, below). This is particularly likely to be the case for those with higher levels of education. Whatever the reasons, the fact is that locating Chinese-speaking respondents proved to be extremely difficult. Given that this problem also affected the NRFU enumeration efforts to reach out to Chinese-speakers as well as to effectively utilize the linguistic skills of its hires,¹³ we make a series of recommendations about how to improve the process for locating Chinese-speaking respondents in the recommendation section of this report.

3.2.2 Co-residency Complications

The specific challenges that NRFU enumerators (and our own research team) confronted amongst Chinese speakers often had more to do with class-mediated residential arrangements than with linguistic or cultural differences per se. We observed that enumerators assigned to areas with significant numbers of undocumented residents not only faced the somewhat typical challenge of reluctance to participate in what was perceived to be an official government surveillance operation, but, in the case of Chinese speakers, a series of additional unique challenges, including multiple households and/or virtual strangers living at and sharing one census address, frequent movement amongst residences, and long and/or unusual working hours (often seven days a week) -- all of which made obtaining access and valid information particularly challenging. Thus for example, in many such situations Chinese-speaking residents reported they did not even know the names of people with whom they shared a home. In many of these situations, respondents appeared to not be seeking to evade questions or conceal information but simply did not know the full names of people they shared a living space with, because most people in such situations work long and unusual hours, and seldom stay for a long period of time.

In one such hostel/dormitory situation in an area in Maryland, a middle-aged male respondent from Shanxi Province could only offer a general guess at the total number of residents (about 10) but did not know any of their names (“*yi ge ye bu zhidao*”, 一个也不知道], let alone any birthdates (see full transcript of LY/R2). In a similar situation in an area in New York, one researcher described in his field notes how residents reacted to questions about names and birthdates:

Middle-aged Chinese man (forty-something?) came to the front door. He would become R28. Was accompanied by another twenty-something Chinese man. Both had been among those sitting in the back just before. Both were pretty amicable. All interactions would be in Mandarin and located on stoop just outside front door. Both expressed no hesitation in assisting E3 with her work. R28 was primary respondent, but the other young man stood close by, listened, and also contributed and discussed with R28. According to R28, nine people lived at the address. This was not a family residence, as the people didn’t really know each other. They basically just lived together

¹³ For example one Chinese-speaking NRFU interviewer had encountered no Chinese speakers in a two week period, despite having been hired in part because of his Chinese language skills.

(“住在一起”) as housemates. R28 and the man provided their own personal information, but could only provide last names for the other residents. R28 literally laughed out loud when E3 asked for birthdays, saying how could he know their birthdays if he didn't even know their names. E3 asked for estimated ages, which R28 provided, saying for example 五十多 for one person, and then E3 basically made up a birthday to fill in.

In a third situation, an enumerator learned during an interview that her respondent, a young recent immigrant from Guangdong, stayed with his sister in a suburban townhouse community two days a week, during which time he took care of his young niece. The remainder of each week he spent at a DC-area restaurant, where he both worked and slept. Despite his objections that he wanted to be counted as living with his sister, the enumerator insisted they needed to record him as living in the District of Columbia, even after she learned that he literally slept in the restaurant where he worked. According to the respondent, he lived with his sister, but the enumerator insisted that he slept most of the week in the restaurant, so for the purposes of the census that must be his “home.” In the following exchange, the enumerator has written down the address of the respondent's place in the District of Columbia and asks him about his living arrangements (for full transcript see RS/R3):¹⁴

E: So this is well you usually live. Do you live alone there? The question is, do you live alone, or do you live with other people?

R: Well, because this is a worker's hostel there are other people there.

E: Eh, this is a worker's hostel? None of you know if he [inferred – the boss?] has registered you with the census?

R: Well, I haven't lived there very long.

E: Ah, therefore he definitely did not help you register. Wah, this is a worker's hostel. Well, I'll just focus on you, and register you. At that place do all of the others work at that company?

R: Yes, but they don't live there.

E: What, they don't live there?

¹⁴ E: 那通常在那里住，那那里住是就你一个人住？这间屋是就你一个人住，还是还有其他人住的？

R: 呃，因为工宿舍所以有些人住宅这里。

E: 哦，这个是员工宿舍来的？那那時候。。。你都不知道他有没有和你登记到，是不是？

R: 哦，因为我在那里住的不是很久。

E: 哦，所以他就没有帮你登记到。哦，这个是员工宿舍来的。那我就当你。。。当你一个人的，来登记。就是那里都有其他员工在那间公司做的？

R: 有，但是不是在那里住的。

E: 哦，不是在那里住的？

R: 嗯，就是只有我在那里住的。。我是登记在这里的，但是我登记的地址，我

E:

是。但是你那里的时间住的多过这里。。。在那里登记都不要紧。。。不要紧。。。但是你？你登记这里吗？

R: 是

E: 哦，就是其实你也是就你一个人在那里住的？这样，那我不要当员工宿舍了，不要当有其他人当你一个人。Ok，那我要你的那个姓还有那个名，你先给我你的名。

R: No, it's only me living there. But for registering an address, I [want to] register here.

E: You register here? But you ...it's not that important ... where you register isn't that important. But you do live more of your time there, right?

R: Yes.

E: Ah, well isn't it a fact that you live alone over there? In this case, I don't want to assist the staff at your hostel or anyone else, but just you. OK, I want your surname and given name, give me your given name first (RS/R3, May 12th, 2010).

While these enumeration challenges are probably not limited to Chinese immigrants, they may be accentuated by Chinese cultural norms that dictate that people outside one's kin network and personal social network are of little concern (Hwang, 1987). Thus in a situation in which people share temporary housing with strangers, knowing much information about these strangers is not culturally normative. This point was noted by one of our team's field researchers, in her fieldwork summary report:

Several other factors lent special difficulty to enumerating Chinese households. The most significant of which was multiple households residing in the same address (R10, R26, R28, R38, R40). A respondent would come to the door, readily answer questions about himself and his family, but then be unable to provide any information at all about the tenants living in other rooms. E3 cited this as a particular problem in her canvassing territory, and she described it as a characteristically Chinese living situation. E3 gave a number of anecdotes to this point, of inter-household anonymity, correlating with illegal immigrant status, and the concomitant reluctance and evasiveness this engenders with respect to enumerators.

Another difficulty put forward by enumerators was that Chinese respondents were rarely home. This is presumably because they worked uncommonly long hours. RA-3/E4 talked about working late into the evening, even past 10 p.m. because that was the best time to catch Chinese restaurant workers at home. He claimed he could identify such households by their front yards, which were uniformly unkempt. RA-3/E3 also suggested that many Chinese people might own a bed in New York, but then be away for days at a time because they worked and slept in another city [*Wong Fieldwork Summary*].

Taken together, these factors clearly made accurate enumeration in short-term or hostel-type housing situations a daunting if not virtually impossible task for many of the enumerators of Chinese-speakers that we observed. A number of these enumerators confronted such challenges with creative -- if hardly orthodox or prescribed -- strategies. In the most problematic case we witnessed, a Chinese-speaking female census worker first attempted to gather as much information as she could from two Chinese men who shared a dormitory/townhouse residence with seven others. The men could provide names and approximate ages only, so the enumerator created fictional birthdates that corresponded with these approximate ages. More typical strategies did not necessarily involve the outright "invention of information" but sought to maximize returns from whatever source was readily available, regardless of the potential quality of these. Thus, for example, in another case we observed an enumerator on her third visit to a home in a rural subdivision, where she found a 15-year-old boy at home and conducted her interview with him, even after he told her he was only 15. Beyond the fact that he was under-aged, he was of limited help to the enumerator, because he was not sure how old his parents were or when they had moved to the United States.

Our main recommendation for a future project is to use existing demographic information as well as experiential knowledge to better identify target areas. Having done so, pre-fieldwork contacts and visits should be made by fieldworkers to targeted local census offices to meet and brief not just administrators but just as importantly crew leaders and enumerators.

3.2.3 Interaction Effects

3.2.3.1 Enumerator Perceptions of our Research Team as “Evaluators”

Another major challenge that we confronted involved a tendency for administrators and enumerators alike to view our research through a lens that assumed we were there to evaluate their work, much as in the case of the many other visitors they had hosted “from the DC office.” This led a number of administrators to pair us only with Chinese-speaking enumerators on the assumption that we were there to assess the effectiveness of Chinese-speaking enumerators, rather than to observe how Chinese respondents coped with a variety of enumerators (some of whom inevitably would not be Chinese-speaking). Most enumerators also clearly assumed we had been tasked with observing and evaluating their work. In fact in one LCO, crew leaders actually told enumerators we were from the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) sent to evaluate enumerators. When asked about this, one crew leader reported he had been told this by the assistant manager, a woman originally from China.

Efforts by enumerators to manage what they perceived to be our “evaluation” of their performance were most evident when we taped interviews. Indeed, we found that the act of taping enumerator-respondent interactions affected the speech and actions of enumerators much more than it did that of respondents. Enumerators, whatever their native language or ethnicity, uniformly would read each question word for word to a respondent when being tape-recorded in situations in which English was the language of communication. This was in sharp contrast to a less literal approach most enumerators used in non-taping situations. One example of this is the use of List C, which asks respondents if they or any household members are of Hispanic origin. In obvious cases where this was clearly not the case (such as with a South Asian or East Asian family), enumerators would either skip the question or reference it in passing in non-taped enumerations. However, when a team member was taping this encounter, enumerators would always ask the respondent the formal question and wait for a response. Indeed, in at least two Chinese language enumerations that were taped, we observed this as well.

3.2.3.2 Unintended Consequences of Outside Observer Presence

Finally, we found that in both taped and non-taped interviews, enumerators would at times allude to the outside observer (i.e. a member of our research team) in an effort to induce a reluctant respondent to provide census data. In the following example quoted from our observations, a Chinese-speaking enumerator tried to convince an elderly woman who had just arrived from China two days before to have her son or daughter-in-law come to the door and answer census questions:

R: Can you come tomorrow?

E: Tomorrow...but we have this gentleman here. He is from the Census Headquarters. He's very interested in Chinese people participating in the census.

R: Another day is better, another day.

O: Ten minutes.

E: Yes, just ten minutes, because it's difficult for this gentleman to come...very far.

R: (indistinguishable)

E: Yes, this gentleman...he came from a far place, it's not easy...tomorrow he may not be able to have time in his schedule. Just ten minutes, please.

R: No, no (RS/R5, May 13th, 2010).

As the conversation progressed, the enumerator repeated several times that “this gentleman” had traveled a great distance to speak with her, so it was important for her to answer questions. The conversation ended when the woman closed the door (for full transcript see RS/R5)¹⁵.

On a few occasions the presence of an external researcher had other unintended consequences on enumerator-respondent social interactions. A particularly blatant example of such effects occurred in an interview between two native Chinese speakers (both of whom were from Beijing) that took place entirely in English, largely because the two speakers were attempting to manage their status in the presence of a researcher who was clearly a native English speaker (see RS/R-4 full transcript). Near the end of this conversation, a linguistic misunderstanding about the phrase “vacation or seasonal house” became apparent:

E: Okay, so ma'am, when you mentioned there are three people in the household, are they staying here just on April 1st? This year, April 1st, 2010?

R: [no response]

E: Okay, so ... is this a vacation house or seasonal house?

R: What?

E: Does someone live at this house or is this a vacation or seasonal house?

R: Umm, vacation house.

E: It's a vacation house? {Pause of ten seconds} So ..

R: Okay, thank you very much –

E: If this is a vacation house we are not counting the people in this house.

¹⁵ R: 明天来吧？

E: 明天。。。但是就是我们这个正好有位先生，他是从普查局总部过来的。他对这个中国人参加普查特别感兴趣。

R: 改天吧，改天吧。

O: 十分钟。

E: 对，就十分钟，因为这位先生他来很不容易，很远。

R: (indistinguishable)

E: 对，因为这个先生他从。。。就是从挺远的地方开过来，很不容易，明天可能就他的时间可能安排不了。能不能就十分钟？

R: 不会不会。。。.

R: That's fine.

E: If you are not living here this is only your vacation house?

R: Umm, sometimes we live there but –

E: This question just asks you where you usually live here – is this a house or vacation house or recreation house.

R: Oh we usually live in Virginia.

E: You usually live in Virginia? So did you fill out the question form for the address in Virginia?

R: That, I'm not sure if my husband do that.

E: Okay. Okay. So.... Okay, if I have questions can I come over later to ask you because if this is a vacation house we need to go back to --- can you please give me your name?

R: No.

E: Just name ... [no response]. Okay, thank you I really appreciate your help. You have a good day.

The respondent's reply clearly indicates that she did not understand what the enumerator meant by "vacation or seasonal house"; yet rather than reveal that she could not understand this English term by shifting to Chinese, she simply chose "vacation" as her type of house. In doing so, she guessed that in an 'A versus B' question about her house, the default answer would be 'A'. But because of the wording of this census question, there is no default answer: a 'vacation' house is, for all intents and purposes, a 'seasonal' house. As the conversation progressed additional points of confusion arose simply because neither the respondent nor the enumerator were willing to be the first to revert to Chinese and thus concede lower competency in English than the other in the presence of a native English speaker (our research team member). Later, when our team member asked the enumerator about this, she replied:

E: But for this lady I understand for it because he has already bad experience, she does not want to provide information. But for this kind of case what do you suggest to do?

O: I don't know. Did you think of speaking Chinese to her? I'm surprised you would only speak English.

E: I speak Chinese to her last time. Because I was thinking you are here and she is very fluent in English so she preferred speaking English.

O: Oh ...

3.2.4 The Limits of "Single-Encounter Ethnography"

A final methodological observation that necessarily qualifies our findings is that we believe the very short time frame of our observations clearly limited the depth of responses, both by enumerators and respondents. For respondents, we appeared at their doors with a person scripted as a federal official, carrying a "U.S. Census" shoulder bag, a clipboard with official-looking documents, and wearing an identity badge with a government seal. The surveillance aspect of this dynamic is quite evident, particularly from the perspectives of immigrant respondents—but, as we have noted, also from the perspective of enumerators themselves. Consequently, when we were able to interview Chinese-speaking respondents about, for example, their opinions on the purpose of the census, either in the United States or in their home country, a common (and strategically safe) answer was, "I don't know." Given the context of these interactions [strangers at the door marked as aspects of "the state" and asking for personal information], this was a most

understandable answer. This challenge -- to gain the trust of respondents to reveal personal information -- was recognized by several of the enumerators we interviewed as perhaps the most difficult aspect of their job. In many ways this same challenge haunted our own interviews and observations as well, which while ethnographically-informed (in the sense of drawing from our knowledge about the community and its communicative conventions) could hardly be described as “full blown” ethnography in any conventional sense of that term.

4 Findings

4.1 Understandings of the Census

4.1.1 The Purpose of the Census through a Chinese Experiential Lens

Based on our interviews, it was very clear that almost all Taiwan-born and mainland-born respondents had only a very general idea of the purpose of the U.S. Census. For example, when asked, some responded that it was for counting the population, others were unsure, and several said they had no idea or did not know. An elderly woman thought it was for checking household registration documents [*hukou*, 户口]. When told this was not the case, her husband thought it strange that personal identity documents were not checked, and wondered how this prevented people without documents from being counted. Other answers included:

- “For the government to understand things about the people.”
- “To count people.”
- “For social security.”
- “To determine the age of the population.”
- “To determine if the population was increasing.”
- For “measuring the population” [统计人口多少人] – repeated by a second respondent [在美国人口是多少].
- “That’s a national management question, no? If the country doesn’t know how big the population is it’s difficult to manage. This is quite normal, it’s normal, and should be this way.”
- “I think it should be to investigate the population’s living standards, or something like that”.
- “To understand the situation of citizens...”

Asked the purpose of a census in their home countries, responses were quite similar. One woman from mainland China said the census in China was about political affairs [*zhengzhi*, 政治], by which she meant government projects. A Taiwan-born respondent said that the census in Taiwan was to calculate the total number of people on the island, including those who had died, minorities, and immigrants, as well as education statistics. A middle-aged man from mainland China said it was to “check the situation of the population,” while another man said it was “all a part of the management system for a country” [都是国家的一种管理制度]. A young man said it was to “check on family size” or perhaps on all aspects of working conditions, as well as on local

problems and issues”.¹⁶ One of our interviewees was a woman originally from Hong Kong who had worked as an enumerator on the 1990 Hong Kong census. She said in her experience questions were much more detailed, asking for household income data and career information.

When asked to compare the objectives of a census in their home countries with those of the United States, the most common answer was “the same” (一样的). This answer is logical if you believe that the overriding goal of a government census is to count the total population. What this view does not consider, however, is the deeper purpose of counting. Since the implementation of strict family planning policies in the 1980s the national census in mainland China has had two main objectives: accurately calculating the national population in order to better enforce family size and residency restrictions and creating a pool of data for state-directed social and economic programs. These objectives are clearly fundamentally different than those of the United States Census -- to accurately calculate the total population (including foreigners and undocumented residents) to distribute seats in the House of Representatives and, as a side effect, to determine the distribution of federal educational, highway, and law enforcement funding, among other programs.

What was striking about this lack of knowledge about the purpose of the U.S. Census was the relatively long amount of time respondents have been living in the United States. Of 23 Chinese-speaking respondents, 12 had been living here 10 or more years, and 15 had been in the country more than five years.¹⁷ In supplementary interviews with five Taiwanese immigrants who had lived in the United States between 14 and 33 years, similar responses were given.

We also found a surprising degree of ambiguity among enumerators about the purpose of the census. Many appeared to be as confused or as uninterested in the actual reasons for gathering census data as many respondents. While all enumerators we observed knew that the census aimed to count all people in the country, several Chinese-speaking enumerators could not explain what this data would be used for, beyond “helping the community,” as one said. This was most apparent among recent immigrants, and much less apparent among younger enumerators who had lived in the United States most of their lives. This lack of deep knowledge about census rationales may have as much to do with individual perceptions about identity and belonging as with different uses of the census in China, Taiwan, and the United States.

4.1.2 Assessing Media Impact: Mixed Effects

Just 3 of 23 respondents indicated that they read English-language periodicals or watched English-language television often. Instead, most learned about news, both international and domestic, by reading Chinese newspapers (the most common being “The World Daily” [世界日报], reading Chinese language websites, watching Chinese television stations (local access or satellite), or chatting with friends. Overall, a majority of respondents indicated they had seen

¹⁶ 都是查一下有什么人口，或者你的工作情况各方面的东西，还有这个区的一些问题这样。

¹⁷ YEARS IN THE UNITED STATES (23 total respondents): 31, 20 (2 respondents), 15 (2 respondents), 14 & 12 (married couple), 13 (3 respondents), 10 (4 respondents), 9, 8, 5, 3 (2 respondents), 2, 1, several months, just visiting, no answer.

information about this year's census in media and public outlets, primarily Chinese language newspapers and (in the New York City area) on Chinese-language television. As one of our team members noted in his fieldwork summary, most respondents he interviewed had seen census advertisements in Chinese newspapers, and some parents said their school-age children had told them about this, "but this was an inattentive, passive, and uncaring sort of awareness." We had initially hypothesized that a suspicion of government intentions based on personal experiences in China would be the primary reason for not completing census forms. However, we found no evidence of such a conscious strategy of avoidance.

The Census media campaign appears to have been effective in communicating to a range of Chinese speakers the fact that a national census would be held in 2010 and their participation was important. If this was the intended purpose of this campaign, and if the intended audience was established residents, then it was a success. These residents, whether long-settled Taiwanese immigrants or recently-arrived Mainland Chinese professionals, appear to participate at rates similar to other U.S. residents of their socio-economic class status. The success of this media campaign in reaching recently-arrived Mainland Chinese immigrants of lower socio-economic standing is much less clear. The more pertinent question to pose within the community of Chinese-speakers may be: "*How to improve the census participation rate of native Chinese speakers who do not perceive themselves as a member of the national community and hence do not perceive themselves to have any stake in a U.S. census outcome?*" Clearly a message that is focused on communicating the benefits of census participation will not be effective if the receivers of this message do not perceive themselves as benefitting from participation. In other words, the issue amongst Chinese speakers is not an awareness problem, but a stakeholder problem. This has two dimensions: identifying with a Chinese-American community, and identifying with a broader American community.

While a vibrant civic association tradition exists within the American Chinese community, these largely remain in the domain of long settled immigrants from Taiwan or Hong Kong, or American-born Chinese. The director of one such association in the Washington, DC metropolitan area, a second-generation Chinese American whose parents immigrated from Taiwan, explained in an interview that it is difficult to attract more recent immigrants from China to volunteer or participate in programs. This was in part due to time and transportation issues. Many of this center's activities, such as English language classes and cultural activities, are held during evening hours in suburban public schools, when working class immigrants very often are still working or lack transportation. However, she also said she thought this had to do with differences between Taiwanese and mainland Chinese views of volunteering. "We volunteer" she said, "they don't" -- a comment that highlights social and cultural differences between these two communities, as well as the continued relevance of the Chinese concept of *guanxi*.

Guanxi, or "relationships," continues to be the primary means for mainland Chinese to cultivate social, work, and personal ties (Farh et.al. 1998, Bian 1997). Chen and Chen (2004) define this concept as an "an informal, particularistic personal connection between two individuals who are bounded by an implicit psychological contract to follow the social norms of *guanxi* such as maintaining a long term relationship, mutual commitment, loyalty, and obligation" (306). Most researchers agree on the key attributes of *guanxi*: these networks are personal, particularistic, and usually based on a common link, such as birthplace or ancestral home (*laojia*), school, or

workplace (Chen & Chen 2004: 310). *Guanxi* ties shape an individual's social network, effectively limiting ties with strangers by defining some as outside of one's network of obligation and reciprocity. Thus, it is not at all unusual that Chinese immigrants do not participate in social organizations that serve an ambiguous ethnic community, or for that matter know or even care very much about neighbors who might also be immigrants but not part of a personal network, as illustrated in this field note:

Discussing this last visit and walking a few blocks to the next address, E3 voiced her opinions on Chinese people and privacy. According to her, many residences in this area contain one family to each room, which among other things makes enumeration complicated. She also said that this situation leads to people at the same address not knowing each other's names. (This corroborates with several of the households I visited with E3 during our two days together.) E3 believed that Chinese people liked to keep their privacy, especially in those kinds of situations, which was why sometimes the person who came to the door could only provide last names. (Ex: They address housemates only as “__ 先生”) (*Wong Field Notes*).

Guanxi ties, or the lack thereof, not only continue to be important within Chinese immigrant communities, but also can take new forms. For example, some research suggests that vigorous nationalist sentiments have emerged among recent mainland Chinese immigrants in countries such as the United States, especially among members of privileged classes such as students and professionals (Liu, 2005). This increased sense of nationalism works against the development of a broader pan-Chinese Diaspora. Instead of identifying as either Chinese-American or Asian-American, the desired identity category of many older activists in the United States (Toyota, 2010), significant numbers of recent mainland immigrants see themselves as Chinese.

4.2 The NRFU Interview

The following findings focus on how linguistic differences and cultural factors--including culturally informed communicative conventions -- influenced the NRFU interviews that we observed involving Chinese-speaking enumerators and Chinese-speaking respondents. For reasons that we have already explained, our observations did not include any instances in which non-Chinese enumerators interacted with Chinese speakers; thus our analysis of interpretation draws only on a few limited observations about how enumerators and respondents navigated the challenge of difference in Chinese dialect. We have also been able to observe interactions between Chinese-speaking enumerators and respondents of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

4.2.1 Census Questions

While we observed that certain census questions often led to mutual confusion in the English language conversations observed in our control group, some of these actually proved less confusing when posed in Chinese. One example is question #1, “How many people were living or staying in this house on April 1, 2010?” In the English-language interviews we observed confusion often resulted from enumerators first asking how many people lived in a home and then asking the formal question with the verb “staying” replacing “living” on April 1st. Interestingly, in Chinese conversations this question was less confusing because enumerators would use the verb 住, “to live or to stay,” thus avoiding the ambiguity that resulted from the slight differences in English between “living” and “staying.” In the following example from our

fieldwork, there was no confusion about this issue, once the enumerator re-worded the question in her Chinese translation (although there is evident reluctance on the part of the respondent to offer a clear answer for reasons related to his immigration status):¹⁸

E: The most important is...good....So my name is "Christina." This is my "card." I am with, with "U.S. Census Bureau," this Census Bureau. Basically we want to ask, are you already living here on April 1st, whether your family was living here on April 1st or moved in on April 1st?

R: We were already living here on April 1st.

E: (same time as R) Living here on April 1st, ok, good. Do you usually live here, or sometimes live here?

R: I usually live here.

E: You usually live here, okay. Who lives here? How many people sleep here? How many heads?

R: About 5.

E: Five? How many? You can tell me, because this is actually independent. We are not part of the Immigration Bureau, not anyone else, we're just...

R: Well, because we...eh...some people return ... because I came back 2-3 days ago ... I came back in order to work.

E: Oh, that's alright...we're here, basically if you sleep here most of the time, we will record you here, and also some questions here. They want to know, because it's about the funding for roads and various allocations. They also ask here whether anyone lives somewhere else because of work, but we will count those who live here most of the time. So you can think about the most number of people.

R: Then it's five.

¹⁸E:最重是。。。好。。。那么我的名字呢就是Christina啦。那这个是我的card。。。我是这个，这个的这个人口调查局的。那基本上我们就想问，就是你们住在这里，是不是4月1号已经在这里住着？你们的家庭是不是4月1号在这里住着还是4月1号搬进来的

R: 4月1号已经在这里住着了

E: 4月1号已经在这里住着了。。。ok, good. 那你们通常都是住在这里，还是有时候才住在这里？

R: 通常都住在这里

E: 通常都住在这里，ok，那那些人在这里住啊，睡啊，有多少人口，有多少人呢？人头数？

R: 呃。。。5个上下吧

E: E: 5个？

多少个呢？你可以说的，因为其实是独立的。我们这个，不是移民居，不是其他人，我们只是。

R...不是，因为我们。。。呃。。。有些人是回。。。因为我是回来两三日这样。。。我回来作事情这样

E:哦，不要紧,我们这里，主要就是说如果你是多数时间在这里睡，我们就记录这里，跟着这里还有一些问题问，他们都想知道的，因为他说关于道路，那些经费的，那些各方面的配给。这里他也有问有没有人因为工作，住在另间屋有些时间，但是如果大部分时间都是住在这里，那我们就会当那些人口，那你想大部分人的数量。

R: 那就是五个。

Then it's five.

4.2.2 Cultural views of “race” and “ethnicity”

The categories of “ethnicity” and “race” were not problematic to Chinese-speaking respondents, largely because, as we observed, enumerators actually did not even ask this question. Rather they tended to assume (and fill in the response on their own without even posing the question) or else suggest to respondents that they were (obviously) “Chinese” -- a suggestion to which respondents agreed in all such cases of NRFU interviews that we observed. The only exception occurred in supplementary interviews with a group of immigrants from Taiwan. In these interviews, several respondents who had lived most of their lives on Taiwan not only identified as Chinese but stated their *laojia* (native place) was in China. In each of these three cases (two male and one female), the respondents’ families had left China before the 1949 collapse of the Nationalist government and the establishment of the People’s Republic of China. However, two other respondents, both of approximately the same age and generation of the above, identified themselves not as Chinese but Taiwanese and said they had written this on the census forms they submitted by mail.

A final interesting note on ethnicity is that we found no evidence to support the hypothesis that a shared sense of identity was important to respondents. That is to say, the extent to which respondents were more open to ethnic Chinese as opposed to non-Chinese enumerators was unclear, beyond the utilitarian advantages of a shared language. This may be due to some degree to the fact that the Chinese Diaspora in the United States consists of ethnic Chinese from not just China proper but also Taiwan, the former British colony of Hong Kong, and Southeast Asia.

4.2.3 Formality vs. Informality: To what degree were scripts followed?

Observing and analyzing linguistic interactions between Chinese-speaking enumerators and Chinese-speaking respondents highlights the rhetorical role that repetition plays in these language exchanges, especially when the intention of the speech act is to extract information. In such exchanges, the questioner will often repeat a respondent’s answer as a rhetorical device in order to probe deeper or as a means of transitioning to another question. In the example below an enumerator is trying to ascertain if the respondent lived at a specific address:

R: 是这样，我们是刚刚。。。刚刚买这个房的。

This is the situation, we just ... we just bought this house, just moved in. E: 哦，刚刚搬进来。

Ah, Ah, you just moved in. R: 搬进来不到十天的样子。

It hasn’t even been ten days. E: 哦，刚刚搬进来不到十天？那你就是说，这个四月一号呢？四月一号你在这里吗？

Ah, it hasn’t even been ten days? Based on what you just said, what about April 1st? Where were you living on April 1st? R: 不在，四月一号我在别的地方，我在。。。

Not here, on April 1st I was in a different place, I was E: 啊，四月一号，你在别的地方。

Ah, on April 1st you were in a different place. R: 我们是。。。我们是五月一号刚搬进来的。

We ... we just moved here on May 1st.*E: 哦，五月一号刚搬进来。。。。*

Ah, you just moved here on May 1st.*R: 对对。*

Right, right.

In this example the enumerator replies to the respondent's answers to her questions by literally repeating each of his answers. She then tries to learn if anyone else had been living in this home on April 1st, using the same repetitive technique:

E: 那您知道这个地址原来四月一号住的人吗？

Did you know who was living in this house on April 1st?

R: 没有。。。。

No.

R [wife]: 不住人，他是空房的。

Nobody lived here, it was vacant.

R: 空房的。

Vacant.

E: 它是空的？

It was vacant?

R: 它是搬空的。

It was vacant.

E: 是搬空的。就是四月一号是搬空的房子？

It was vacant. So on April 1st this house was not occupied?

R: 对对对，搬空的房子。

Correct, it was an unoccupied home.

E: Okay。

Younger enumerators and those that had lived in the United States for a relatively short time tended to follow fieldwork procedures more faithfully. One young Chinese-American man did not leave slips with his personal cell phone number (a tactic used by enumerators observed by RA-1 and RA-2) because, he said, he had been told in his training not to do this. Similarly, a middle-aged Chinese woman was invited several times by respondents to enter their homes but each time replied that it was “against the rules.” On the other hand, more experienced enumerators (RA3-E3 and TL-E2) took such invitations for granted and in at least two cases suggested to respondents the interviews be conducted inside because it was raining. Enumerators who left their names and phone numbers only did so with Chinese-speaking respondents, which is evidence of a sense of ethno-linguistic community on the part of enumerators.

In addition, when Chinese-speaking enumerators encountered Chinese speakers, they broke the NRFU script for two specific questions (Hispanic status and race) when visual cues provided an answer. In addition, three fieldworkers (RA-1, RA-3 and TL) observed at least one case each in which enumerators broke script on the question, “Does person __ sometimes live or stay somewhere else?” Although enumerators would pose this question in Chinese, they did not offer

the set of examples provided on the NRFU script. In at least one situation (RA-1 / E-1) this was due to the enumerator's limited Mandarin. In other cases (RA-3/E-3, TL-E-2 and E-3) native speakers skipped these examples.

When Chinese-speaking enumerators interacted with non-Chinese speakers, they closely followed the NRFU script. Depending on their English language ability, this could lead to cross-cultural frustrations, especially if a respondent asked a question that required the enumerator to shift "off script," as illustrated in one research assistant's field notes:

Although I only encountered Chinese households with E2, my experiences with E3 also represented a different set of cross-cultural and linguistic barriers. E3 was the only one from a different background: he was a middle-aged man born in Xian who moved to the States 13 years ago and spoke heavily-accented and choppy English. He was working in an upper class neighborhood with many foreign residents, many of whom were embassy families detailed to work in the United States for a few years and were not native English speakers themselves. A number of them were unaware of or not familiar with the census process. E3 used phrases such as "this is part of the government" and "we need to count how many people are here" in order to explain the purpose and legitimacy of his visit. He was fine when sticking exactly to the script, but when respondents had questions or displayed reluctance, he had difficulty communicating answers effectively. He also worked more slowly than the other enumerators because he was very deliberate in writing the answers down, spelling names, and asking the questions. The lengthiness of some of his interview seemed to frustrate at least a few people (*Yeung Fieldwork Summary*).

4.2.4 Interpretation Issues

Translation quality depended on the language abilities of the enumerators. For example, in a Maryland case, the enumerator, an American-born Chinese man who spoke Mandarin as a second language, had difficulty explaining to a Mandarin-speaking respondent why he was asking questions, reverting to saying "U.S. Census Bureau" in English. No enumerators we encountered had been given access to Census Bureau Chinese language materials.

Communicative events involving speakers who ostensibly shared the same language could lead to wrong information. For example, in an interview with a Chinese-speaking male head of household, this same enumerator successfully listed four household members: the man (age 46), his wife (age 40), son (age 10), and daughter (age 3). He then realized a fifth person lived in the home, another man. The respondent stated in English this was his "son-in-law," using English because he apparently assumed the enumerator would not understand *yuefu* [岳父], "father-in-law" in Chinese. When he reported this man's birth year as 1940 it should have been clear from the context that he did not mean "son-in-law." Nevertheless, after asking the respondent to confirm the year, the enumerator completed his form without comment (*see transcript LY/R1(b) for this dialogue*). Other language issues related to a lack of knowledge of the mainland Chinese Romanization system (*pinyin*) on the part of Taiwan, Hong Kong, and overseas Chinese enumerators. In several cases the spelling of names was complicated by this issue.

5 Enumerator Views of Cultural Issues

In debriefing interviews with enumerators it became clear that the majority, both Chinese and English speakers, did not consider culture to be an issue. Typical was the response of a Korean-

American woman, who stated that culture played no role in the process (yet then went on to say that she believed non-native English speakers were usually more friendly and polite).

Several viewed the enumeration process as simply an information exchange process. From their perspective, this process failed [meaning the enumeration was not completed] for one of three reasons: the respondent did not know enough English to understand the questions and there was no interpreter available; the respondent could understand the questions but did not know the purpose of the enumeration; or the respondent understood the questions and the reasons for the census and did not want to cooperate. Rather surprising, only two enumerators specifically spoke of fear or worries about immigration status as an issue. One, a young Chinese-American man, recognized immigration status as an issue but linked this to a lack of understanding about the census, explaining that:

Most are really cooperative because they know this helps them and the community ... I feel like the ones who aren't responsive are either afraid of maybe their immigration status or just don't understand what the census really is for...

In situations in which respondents clearly did not understand English, enumerators generally agreed that their best tactic was to use the census language card to identify the target language and check with their crew leader to see if a language-qualified enumerator could make a return visit to the household. But in the other two situations noted above, enumerator views shed light on cultural issues. In particular, this points to two assumptions: knowledge (or the lack thereof) about the purpose of the census, and the degree of cooperation respondents offered.

A respondent reluctance to take part in the census process because of a lack of knowledge about the census was a view shared by several enumerators. For example, a young, white male enumerator viewed non-language issues as based solely on a lack of knowledge. Because of this, he sought to explain the reasons for and benefits of the census, and respondents would (he assumed) then respond in a specific way -- that is, by recognizing the value and benefits of taking part. In discussing this, he spoke about one couple:

[They] spoke English but had an accent I guess they really didn't understand what the ... I mean who I was, I explained it to them but it took a little bit of talking to get through to them about the census, what it is, I guess to educate them about thethe process and everything.

When asked what he meant, he added, "They [the couple] just didn't know exactly what it was, they thought it might have been ... I mean, someone targeting them physically I just think they weren't educated on what the census was." This view was echoed by another enumerator, a white middle-aged woman:

Once you explain what the census is and that it's for schools, hospitals, nursing homes, it's been done many, many years for -- every ten years, and it's also to determine how many congressional representatives are to be sent to Congress for the area, people are quite willing to participate.

Similarly, a young second-generation Chinese-American man related a story about the lengths to which immigrants would sometimes go in order to avoid census workers, yet explained this as due to a lack of knowledge:

We went to someone's house and there was an elderly Asian gentleman that was working in the yard. And when he saw us, we told him who we were, and he ran back inside and he shut his door and screamed out his window, 'Go away! We don't want you here, and don't come back again!' ... in English ... well, like in broken English. Mostly, it's like that -- either they pretty much tell us to go away, we don't want to see you again ... don't come back ..."

In each of these cases, enumerators explained these reactions as examples of a knowledge problem. The facts and effects of the census process were taken as objective and universally knowable, without any cultural referents or links. Enumerators believed that once given access to this body of knowledge, people would logically understand the value and worth of the census process, recognize they would personally benefit, and willingly participate. A Vietnamese-born woman went so far as to link this to the Internet:

I got one, he is from Asia. He told me this is the first time, he didn't know what is census, and I explained to him for the head count, and I asked if he wanted to know more about it, the census, he can go on-line to the census website or to Google 'census' and to learn what's the purpose of the census and what the government is going to use this data for"

From this "knowledge problem" perspective, it makes sense to assume that providing factual information that explained the reasons why a census is conducted will lead people of all cultural backgrounds to embrace the census. This view ignores the fact that some people (such as some white Americans) might understand the purpose of the census and still oppose it because of, for example, their views of the government. Indeed, the same enumerator cited above stated that white Americans were usually the respondents who objected to providing information (see below). Similarly, some immigrants or other non-native English speakers might understand the reasons for the census and, although not opposing this on ideological grounds, might simply not care enough to take part or might believe they will not gain any benefits from this. Explaining that their participation will increase local school funding or help determine the make-up of the House of Representatives might well be irrelevant to some people's lives. In other words, not only might some immigrants avoid participating in the census out of fear about the consequences for their immigration status, some might also avoid it because they do not view themselves as stakeholders. Indeed, rather than avoiding participation, which implies an active choice, some immigrants might simply ignore the process as irrelevant to their lived experiences.

A key word for enumerators in our debriefing interviews was **cooperation**. The extent to which respondents provided required information defined their cooperation. *However, while both Caucasian and non-white enumerators used this as a key term and agreed on what constituted cooperation, who they perceived as more or less cooperative was strikingly different.* For example, a white female enumerator linked respondents' English oral communication level with

their willingness to “cooperate.” In the following excerpt, she draws this parallel in two cases, both involving Korean speakers:

I would say that one person, that didn't speak good English, didn't cooperate and we sent somebody out who spoke Korean and he cooperated with them. I tried to explain it to him, I think he spoke enough English to do the census but he didn't want to cooperate with me..... I met another lady, she was also Korean. She was very abrupt, and didn't want to give me any information even as far as who speaks English in the house. I persisted – first she told me nobody spoke English. Maybe she didn't understand me. And then I asked her, ‘Do you have children that speak English?’ and she said yes, and told me to come back in a week, but that didn't make sense to me so I went back that night and her twenty-some year old daughter was there and was very cooperative and gave me the information. If I had listened to the lady who may not have understood me or ... I said should I come back that afternoon and she said, no come back next week. If I had listened to her I would have maybe missed those people but it turned out to be okay....

She contrasted these cases of non-cooperation with another case, a Mongolian man who, in her view, was willing to cooperate despite his language limits:

... there was another gentleman, a Mongolian gentleman, I went there like two times ... he was very cooperative though; he wrote down the names of himself [sic] and his son, he gave me the son's phone number which was wrong the first time and I called it and I got like an American voice on an answering machine with an American name. I went back and he said, ‘Oh, I gave you the wrong number.’ Well, he didn't say that but he indicated it and he gave me the right number and he was very nice and cooperative but he didn't seem to speak much English at all.

In this latter case, the enumerator characterized the respondent as willing to provide information in spite of his limited English skills, and contrasted this with her second example, a Korean woman who may or may not have offered a false excuse (“come back in a week”) and her first example, a Korean man who the enumerator believed could have provided the required information (“I think he spoke enough English to do the Census”).

Her interpretation of who cooperates was very different from that of two Asian-American female enumerators. According to a Korean-American female enumerator, “the people who don't speak English, they are more polite.” A female enumerator originally from Vietnam noted, “The white people said, ‘why I have to provide this information to the government? The government doesn't have any business with my date of birth or ... so on and so forth.’ That's what I got from them.” She went on to add, “I think that ... I cannot say all of them but feel a few, some white person Are very difficult, they really don't want to provide any information and they refuse to collaborate with me.”

In summary, the fact that most enumerators do not consider culture to be an issue demonstrates the extent to which cultural variables are critical in encounters between enumerators and

respondents. However, enumerators who recognized cultural constraints succeeded in completing a NRFU interview by implicitly acknowledging the ambivalent status of respondents. For example, an enumerator who experienced numerous situations in which addresses were informal boarding houses adapted to this reality and was able to learn at least some basic information from respondents, as this field note extract illustrates:

Address was a brick townhouse/small apartment house (don't know the best word for it). E3 had been there before and didn't even try the front door, going straight around back, down driveway/wide alley space, to rear entrance. Knocked on door to no answer, but I noticed a few Asian adults sitting in the window looking out at us, at which point I gestured to E3 ... E3 called out "hello," then switched to Mandarin, introduced self as from census (always as 人口普查员). One of them gestured us to come around front to the main street side entrance. Middle-aged Chinese man (forty-something?) came to the front door. He would become R28. Was accompanied by another 20-something Chinese man. Both had been among those sitting in the back just before. Both were pretty amicable. All interactions would be in Mandarin and located on stoop just outside front door. Both expressed no hesitation in assisting E3 with her work. R28 was primary respondent, but the other young man stood close by, listened, and also contributed and discussed with R28. According to R28, nine people lived at the address. This was not a family residence, as the people didn't really know each other. They basically just lived together ("住在一起") as housemates. R28 and the man provided their own personal information, but could only provide last names for the other residents. R28 literally laughed out loud when E3 asked for birthdays, saying how could he know their birthdays if he didn't even know their names. E3 asked for estimated ages, which R28 provided, saying for example 五十多 for one person ...E3 glossed over the Hispanic origins question by posing it as a blanket question to the entire household, rather than go person by person.

As this narrative illustrates, this enumerator's cultural skills, not just Chinese language ability, made this interview at least partially successful. She recognized both the class status of her respondents and the social realities of this "home" -- a place that housed nine strangers who were linked solely by their ethnicity (Chinese) and class status. She therefore broke with the NRFU script and in doing so gained as much information as the two respondents could honestly provide.

A failed NRFU interview also illustrates the place of cultural, not just linguistic competency. In this case (TL-R#5) a native-Mandarin speaker originally from Beijing sought to complete a NRFU interview in a suburban Maryland townhouse community at around dinner time. The door was answered by an elderly woman who spoke no English and had been in the United States for just two months, visiting her grandchildren, a 10-year-old girl and a boy of around three. During the conversation at the door the sound of cooking was clear, which indicated someone else was at home. The elderly woman said she could not answer the enumerator's questions because she did not live in the U.S. and could not write. The enumerator asked three times if someone else could answer her questions but each time the elderly woman said no. At that point the enumerator evoked the presence of an observer, claiming he was from the Census Bureau, was "very interested in Chinese people participating in the census," and could not return. At this point the elderly woman ended the conversation.

Rather than asking for a contact number, or fixing a time when she could return, the enumerator sought to use a symbol of "the state" to evoke compliance, but failed. Paradoxically, a non-Chinese speaking enumerator might have had a better chance of success in this encounter, since the elderly woman would have not been able to converse at all and might have then brought another adult to the door.

The above data, while very thin, nevertheless supports the research findings of Liang and Ye (2001) and Liang and Marooka (2004), as well as Lin's (2010) discussion of Taiwanese-American demographics. While pockets of Chinese native speakers who are not proficient in English exist, these appear to be based either on the age of migrants or their education and class status. Elderly migrants, even those who have been in the United States for a decade or more, appear to often remain by choice in a Chinese language environment. However, because they have the leisure time to watch television and participate in community events, they also can be readily reached when necessary. Thus the 2010 Census publicity campaign in Chinese newspapers, on Chinese language television, and through local community organizations such as CCACC appears to have succeeded in informing this particular population of the census process. However, this campaign appears to have been less successful with the other pocket of linguistically isolated migrants, mainly young, less educated and in most likelihood undocumented service workers, especially in the restaurant industry.

6 Recommendations

6.1 A Ten-Year Outlook for the Chinese American Community

Most research on the Chinese Diaspora in the United States usually takes the 1965 Hart-Celler Immigration Act as the most important benchmark for analyzing population changes. This Act, which added professional knowledge and skills as criteria for potential immigrants, is widely hailed as enabling the first large-scale influx of Chinese immigrants since the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act (Shi, 2005, p. 59; see also Toyota, 2010). However, focusing on this change, as important as it is, draws attention away from an important shift in Chinese immigration after 1989. As noted at the beginning of this report, the overwhelming majority of Chinese-speaking immigrants now arrive from Mainland China, and approximately 50% continue to cluster in and around three metropolitan areas: greater Los Angeles, the San Francisco Bay area, and metropolitan New York City. Within each of these areas, not only have specific centers of high Chinese population density been identified in 2010 Census and 2005-2009 American Community Survey data, but also specific concentrations of Mainland, Hong Kong, and Taiwanese residents, as illustrated in these examples:

Los Angeles area:

Monterey Park: 24,758 (43.7%) – primarily Mainland Chinese.

San Marino: 5,260 (39.3%) – primarily Taiwanese.

Arcadia: 18,041 (34.0%) – primarily Taiwanese.

San Gabriel: 13,376 (33.6%) – primarily Mainland Chinese.

San Francisco Bay area:

Cupertino: 15,700 (27.2%) – primarily Taiwanese.

Millbrae: 5,500 (26.1%) – primarily Hong Kong.

Foster City: 5,800 (19.2%) – primarily Taiwanese.

Albany: 3,100 (16%) – primarily Mainland Chinese.

Census and ACS data also shows poverty rates, average home prices, median incomes, and average incomes, which together provide a snapshot of a community's class status. For example, Cupertino, California, home of Apple, Inc., has a median household income of over \$120,000, a poverty rate of less than 4%, and a median home price (as of April 2011) of \$886,000. This data suggests that the response rate to the 2010 Census would be relatively strong, which indeed it was -- 79% as opposed to a national average of 74%.

These data, and our qualitative fieldwork, demonstrate that a generalized linguistically-isolated community of Chinese speakers does not exist in the United States. Instead, the demographic of the Chinese-speaking community has undergone a significant transformation in the last two decades. A majority of immigrants now originate in mainland China and are sharply divided into a professionalized class and a less-educated, working class. Although "ethnoburbs" (Wei 1999) of Chinese settlement are clearly discernible, as illustrated above, new immigrants increasingly move out of enclave communities as they gain economic security. For example, in the Washington, DC metropolitan region no discernable Chinese residential enclave can be identified, despite the rapid increase in ethnic Chinese residents since 1990. Instead, what are more discernible are commercial enclaves.

6.2 Specific Recommendations for 2020 Decennial Census

1. The NRFU process involving Chinese speakers must take greater account of socio-economic factors, particularly the fact that class status, not just legal status, influences how potential respondents view census participation. Research in preparation for the 2020 Census should examine links between socio-economic status and census participation. If clear links are found, this will indicate that fewer specialized resources will need to be invested in local census offices (LCO) and/or specific zip codes for the 2020 Census.
2. Before Chinese-speaking enumerators are recruited and assigned to specific local census offices (LCO), every advantage should be taken of the rich data now available from previous census and American Community Survey (ACS) projects. Existing data can be used to estimate not just where Chinese-speaking enumerators should be assigned but also what types should be assigned. In other words, it remains crucial to recognize intra-ethnic differences within the Chinese American population as well as socio-economic class differences. Existing data suggests that, while affluence itself does not guarantee census participation, affluent areas have above average response rates. Importantly, however, the 2010 Census demonstrates that, if nearly 50% of all Chinese speakers live in three metropolitan regions, the remainder, more than 1.5 million, are widely scattered.
3. Building on the above, utilizing qualified Chinese-speaking enumerators in geographic areas based only on the presence of Chinese respondents is not the most efficient use of these enumerators' language skills. In primarily suburban settings, utilizing Chinese speakers as a "reserve" force to send to specific residences after these have been identified as Chinese-speaking households is much more efficient. However, in settings in which a residential enclave can be identified, (such as Flushing/Queens and Sunset Park/Brooklyn, New York) assigning Chinese speakers to field enumerations will be more efficient -- based on socio-

economic data. In other words, different deployment strategies based on context would be beneficial.

4. Chinese language materials already developed by the Census Bureau, including a translated enumeration questionnaire, should be made widely available. None of the enumerators we observed and interviewed said they were aware of bilingual census materials, such as Chinese language assistance guides, “Frequently Asked Questions in Chinese,” or copies of questionnaires in simplified Chinese. Nor were any respondents aware of these materials, except senior citizens who either volunteer with or are regular participants at a local Chinese community association in suburban Maryland. This suggests that having such materials available on-line is clearly not a measure that is sufficient for reaching this intended audience. While certainly cost-efficient, on-line language assistance materials are most accessible to those within the Chinese-speaking community who do not need such assistance, such as professionals who regularly access the Internet. Even if the Census is automated in the future, printed materials should still supplement assistance given to in-language groups. Furthermore, while it may be more cost efficient to digitize the materials, missing count of these populations could end up being more costly for the Census Bureau. Therefore, in support of our recommendations about media targeting, we suggest distributing printed copies of these materials to not just Chinese community centers and supermarkets but also places where undocumented and low-wage workers are most likely to be found, such as restaurants, light industrial sites, and informal employment centers.
5. Publicity campaigns about the census process within the American Chinese-speaking community will be more effective if more attention is placed on defining *the intended target* for this message. While respondents indicated they had read about the census in Chinese-language print media or had seen advertisements on Chinese-language television, this awareness did not always translate into participation. Those who do not appear to participate are people who do not see themselves as members of a broader American community. Print and visual media announcements aimed at this specific audience should recognize that these residents may opt not to participate *not* primarily because of legal status concerns. Instead, some may not complete the census because they do not view themselves as having a stake in the outcome of this exercise, as was the case for several of the respondents we interviewed.
6. Cooperation and outreach efforts with community organizations should be expanded, specifically with organizations that actively target and assist mainland Chinese immigrants. Many existing Chinese American service organizations are often controlled by either long-settled Chinese-Americans or individuals that identify with a Taiwanese or Hong Kong Diaspora, and have more tenuous ties with recent mainland immigrants (Zhou and Kim 2006). Ties with other types of organizations should also be cultivated, such as mainland Chinese student groups on university campuses, religious institutions that primarily serve mainland immigrants, and new professional associations that have emerged in tandem with the increase in mainland immigration.

7 Future Research Directions

In the short term, we suggest further fieldwork that focuses on the class and regional basis of the Chinese Diaspora. In particular, additional fieldwork among service workers is needed, to provide a more detailed portrait of this demographic segment, in particular their perceptions about their place in American society. This fieldwork can and should also investigate the emergence of traditional support structures in areas with sizable population clusters, such as fraternal organizations and hometown support groups.

8 References

- Bian, Y.J. "Bringing Strong Ties Back In: Indirect Ties, Network Bridges, and Job Searches in China." *American Sociological Review* 62 (1997), 366–385.
- Chan, Kam Wing and Li Zhang, "The *Hukou* System and Rural-Urban Migration in China: Processes and Changes". *China Quarterly* 160 (December 1999), 818-856.
- Chen Xiao Ping & Chen Chao. "On the Intricacies of the Chinese *Guanxi*: A Process Model of *Guanxi* Development." *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 21 (2004), 305-324.
- Chin, James. "Reducing Irregular Migration from China." *International Migration* 41:3 (August 2003), 49-72.
- Farh, Jiing-Lih, Anne S. Tsui, Katherine Xin and Bor-Shiuan Cheng. "The Influence of Relational Demography and *Guanxi*: The Chinese Case." *Organization Science* 9:4 (1998), 471-488.
- Hoefler, Michael, Nancy Rytina, and Christopher Campbell. 2007. *Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: January 2006*. August 2007. US Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics. http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/publications/ill_pe_2006.pdf, accessed October 25, 2010.
- Hoefler, Michael, Nancy Rytina, and Bryan Baker. 2010. *Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: January 2009*. Washington, DC: US Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics. http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/publications/ois_ill_pe_2009.pdf, accessed October 25, 2010.
- Hwang, Kwang-Kuo. "Face and Favor: the Chinese Power Game." *American Journal of Sociology* 92:4 (January 1987), 944-974.
- Lagdameo, Mary Angela. "Human Smuggling from Fujian to New York". Masters' Thesis, Department of East Asian Studies, University of Southern California, August 2008.
- Liang, Zai & Wenzhen Ye, "From Fujian to New York: Understanding the New Chinese Immigration" in *Global Human Smuggling: Comparative Perspectives* (ed. David Kyle & Rey Koslowski). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001
- Liang, Zai & Hideki Marooka, "Recent Trends of Emigration from China, 1982-2000." *International Migration* 42:3 (2004)
- Liang, Zai & Ma Zhongdong. "China's Floating Population: New Evidence from the 2000 Census." *Population and Development Review* 30:3 (September 2004), 467-488.

Lin Yi-Ying, "Taiwanese Immigrants in the United States". Migration Policy Institute (July 2010): <http://www.migrationinformation.org/USFocus/display.cfm?ID=790#2>, accessed on October 30, 2010.

Liu Hong. "New Immigrants and the revival of Overseas Nationalism." *Journal of Contemporary China* 14:43 (2005), 291-316.

Pan, Y. (2010). 2010 Census Evaluations, Experiments, and Assessment Study Plan: Observing Census Enumerations of Non-English Speaking Households in the 2010 Census. *2010 Census Planning Memoranda Series. No 105*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Republic of China, Overseas Compatriot Affairs Commission, "Overseas Compatriot Population Distribution".
<http://www.ocac.gov.tw/english/public/public.asp?selno=8889&no=8889&level=B>, accessed October 25, 2010.

Roberts, Kenneth. "China's 'Tidal Wave' of Migrant Labor: What Can We Learn from Mexican Undocumented Migration to the United States?" *International Migration Review* 31:2 (Summer 1997), 249-293.

Rytina, Nancy. 2009. *Estimates of the Legal Permanent Resident Population in 2008*. October 2009. US Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics. Accessed on October 25, 2010 at: http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/publications/ois_lpr_pe_2008.pdf.

Skeldon, Ronald. "Myths and Realities of China's Irregular Migration." *Migration Research Series #1*, International Organization for Migration, Geneva, 2000.

Statistics Canada. "Immigration and Citizenship Highlight Tables, 2006 Census."
<http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/hlt/97-557/Index-eng.cfm>, accessed May 17, 2011.

Terrazas, Aaron and Jeanne Batalova, "Chinese Immigrants in the United States" (May 2010). *Migration Information Source*, Migration Policy Institute, accessed October 25, 2010: <http://www.migrationinformation.org/USFocus/display.cfm?ID=781>.

Toyota, Tritia. *Envisioning America: New Chinese Americans and the Politics of Belonging*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2010.

United States Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics. 2008 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics, accessed October 25, 2010: <http://www.dhs.gov/files/statistics/publications/yearbook.shtm>.

University of Virginia, Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service, Demographics & Workforce, accessed may 18, 2011: http://www.coopercenter.org/sites/default/files/demographics/Census_2010_Race.xls.

Wei Li. "Building Ethnoburbia: The Emergence and Manifestation of the Chinese Ethnoburb in Los Angeles' San Gabriel Valley." *Journal of Asian American Studies* 2:1 (1999), 1-28.

Xinhua News Agency. “报告显示未来中国流动迁移人口将保持2亿至3亿规模” (Report Shows a Coming Floating Population of 200 to 300 Million People), May 30, 2011. Accessed June 1, 2011: http://news.xinhuanet.com/2011-05/30/c_13901731.htm

Yu Shi. “Identity Construction of the Chinese Diaspora, Ethnic Media Use, Community Formation, and the Possibility of Social Activism.” *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 19:1 (March 2005), 55-72.

Zhou Min & & Rebecca Kim. “The Paradox of Ethnicization and Assimilation: The Development of Ethnic Organizations in the Chinese Immigrant Community in the United States” in Kuah-Pearce Khun Eng & Evelyn Hu-DeHart (eds.), *Voluntary Organizations in the Chinese Diaspora*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2006, 231-252.

Zhou, Yu and Lan-Hong Nora Chiang, “Assimilation and Rising Taiwanese Identity: Taiwan-Born Immigrants in the United States, 1990-2000.” *Journal of Population Studies* 38 (June 2009), 115-160.

9 Appendix A: Chinese Enumerator Interactions with Non-Chinese Speakers

While the primary focus of this specific study was to observe and analyze the linguistic and cultural factors that affected the rate and quality of NRFU participation by Chinese-speakers, in the course of our study we also observed a large number of NRFU interviews conducted with English-speaking respondents. As a result our study produced a series of findings that went beyond our initial scope—specifically addressing how English-speaking respondents reacted to interviewers who may have spoken English but whose own communicative conventions were influenced by Chinese. In this Annex we briefly summarize our observations of how English-speaking respondents interacted with and responded to bilingual enumerators of Chinese origin.

A. Census Questions

Certain census questions led to mutual confusion, particularly in situations when some enumerators would read questions literally without providing any practical context. One example is question #1, “How many people were living or staying in this house on April 1, 2010?” Confusion usually resulted from enumerators first asking how many people lived in a home and when asking the formal question with the verb “staying” replacing “living” on April 1st. In observed English conversations, an African-American man when prompted stated he lived alone in a condominium. However, when asked about April 1st he hesitated, asking the enumerator what day of the week this had been. He then said that if it was a work day he would not have been home. Another man, also a native English speaker, responded to question 10 (“Does person 1 sometime live or stay somewhere else?”) by saying yes, he occasionally slept at his girlfriend’s apartment – which the enumerator checked off as an affirmative ‘for another reason’ as an answer. In other situations, especially involving houses with multiple temporary occupants, respondents appeared to view themselves as “staying” but not “living” at an address. This confusion was more pronounced when enumerators and respondents did not share a common native language.

B. Cultural views of ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’:

Question 9, concerning respondent’s “race”, caused confusion in encounters between both non-native English speaker enumerators and respondents & between native English speaking enumerators and respondents. In one case, a Pakistani-born woman answered her door and agreed to answer the enumerator’s questions, watched by her three young (American-born) children. When asked to state her “race”, she initially chose “Asian Indian” before her son prompted her to choose “Other Asian” and have the enumerator write, “Pakistani”. This choice led to the following exchange:

E: Okay, thank you. Five Pakistani [begins to write on her form]

R: No, two Pakistani, my husband and I. They [indicates her children] are American.

E: American? No –

R: They were born here. They are American, not Pakistani.

E: No, I’m sorry. This is not about being born, this asks you about race –

[Son]: Put Pakistani, Mom.

R: [Short exchange in Urdu] Okay, Pakistani.

In this exchange the enumerator, a native Chinese speaker, appeared to view the American concept of “race” through the cultural prism of her native language, in which the term *zu* [族] can refer to a range of categories, from village and clan lineage to the English concepts of ‘ethnicity’, ‘race’, and ‘nation’, all linked to some degree by biological kin ties. From this perspective the respondent’s children’s birthplace was irrelevant. The respondent, on the other hand, appeared to view this question as not about ‘ethnicity’, ‘race’, or ‘nation’ but about nationality. Thus, her children, born in the United States, carried American passports and were American.

In a similar case in Virginia, a female respondent examined the information page a Taiwanese female enumerator gave her and decided she should count as ‘Middle Eastern’. After she explained she was originally from Yemen, the enumerator suggested ‘Yemenese’ as her ethnicity. The respondent objected, saying she was an Arab. The enumerator then wrote “Arabian” in the ‘Other’ category.

C. Formality vs. Informality: To what degree were scripts followed?

As noted above, Chinese-speaking enumerators would employ a repetitive grammatical pattern in their interactions with Chinese speakers. Most continued to rely on this repetitive rhetorical pattern in conversations with native English speakers, which in our observations led to frustration, exasperation, and passive-aggressive anger on the part of some respondents. They appeared to perceive this literal repetition of their responses as a sign of language incompetency on the part of enumerators. For example, a white woman who lived six months a year in California and six months in Maryland explained to a Xian-born enumerator that she had already completed the census in California, but became frustrated when he could not answer her questions about her Maryland home:

She was particularly frustrated with one question, “Was this house vacant on April 1?” because she did not want to call it “vacant” since she still resided there some of the time, and E3 did not explain to her the reasoning behind this answer choice and simply said that that’s what she should put down. Eventually, she snapped at him to just give her the sheet, which he did. She looked over it and decided that the responses were satisfactory and gave it back [LY, 5t/11/2010].

D. Interpretation Issues:

Enumerators could not answer this question in most cases, because they did not understand the target language. A Chinese-speaking enumerator said that in her encounters with Spanish speakers, children would be home and would translate. In some instances where children were used as interpreters, enumerators skipped over more complicated questions. For example, in one case a Chinese-speaking enumerator used the young son of a Korean female respondent to extract basic information, such as first and last names. However, she skipped questions about other children such as foster children (H1) and whether the home was owned with a mortgage (H2).

We also observed several situations in which language differences between enumerators and respondents were accentuated by cultural misconceptions. In one instance a native Chinese-speaking man had great difficulty in communicating the purpose of his questions to an Indian woman at home with two children. When she said her husband worked at the Indian Embassy, and therefore they did not need to participate in the U.S. Census, the enumerator could only respond that he was from the Department of Commerce. She eventually provided the names of residents, but refused to provide birthdates.

An unintended consequence of recruiting multi-lingual enumerators to better serve specific language communities is a cultural, not just linguistic, clash with native English speakers. For example, suburban white Americans are confronted with a census taker who looks and sounds 'foreign', which further validates their anger at and suspicion of the federal government. This manifests itself in a veiled sense of exasperation and impatience with language issues. They are exasperated when an enumerator asks them to repeat the spelling of a name or a birth date, perceiving this not as a check-up tool but as evidence of language incompetency. The following field observation illustrates this:

Second stop was a townhouse complex in one area in Virginia. These were 1980s-style townhouses on concrete pads, mass produced, vinyl siding, solidly middle-class, located in a suburban area that has gone from being a white enclave two generations ago to being an ethnically mixed area. At one home, a single white female, approximately early fifties, lived in the house with her daughter. After answering the door and encountering the enumerator (a petite Vietnamese-American woman, also early fifties, with clear English albeit accented), the respondent was very passive-aggressive. She insisted she had sent in her census form and complained about having to answer questions again. She was also visibly frustrated when the enumerator asked her to re-spell her name, signaling her anger with body language, sighs, glances at her watch, shaking her car keys, and using a tone heavy with sarcasm. Ethnic, race, and class issues were clearly an unspoken background aspect of this interaction. This issue was also mentioned by this enumerator later in our debriefing (RJS, 5/8/2010).

E. Knowledge about the Census:

As noted above, many enumerators appeared to be as confused or as uninterested in the actual reasons for gathering census data as many respondents. While this is more noticeable among Chinese enumerators, it also applies to some native English speakers as well. For example, while most white enumerators we observed knew detailed information about the process, such as its role in allocating federal funding for schools and other community services, and its use in allocating seats in the U.S. House of Representatives, they generally assumed that once they communicated this information to respondents all would logically want to participate.

10 Appendix B: ENUMERATOR NRFU QUESTIONNAIRE

S1. Hello, I'm _____ (name) from the U.S. Census Bureau. Is this _____ (address)?

你好，我叫_____。我是从美国人口普查局来的。请问这里是不是_____？

--If no: 可以告诉我_____在哪里吗？

nǐ hǎo, wǒ jiào _____. wǒ shì cóng Měi guó rén kǒu pǔ chá jú lái de. qǐng wèn zhè lǐ shì bù shì _____?

--If no: kě yǐ gào su wǒ _____ zài nǎ lǐ ma?

S2. I'm here to complete a Census questionnaire for this address. It should take about 10 minutes. The first part explains that your answers are confidential. I'll refer to the other parts later. Did you or anyone in this household live or stay here on April 1, 2010?

我需要为这个地址填一份10分钟的人口普查问卷。

第一部分解释您的回答会受到保密。一会儿，我会解释剩下的部分。

在2010年4月1日那天，你或住户成员在这里居住或暂住吗？

wǒ xū yào wéi zhè ge dì zhǐ tián yī fèn shí fēn zhōng de rén kǒu pǔ chá wèn juǎn. dì yī bù fèn jiě shì nín de huí dá huì shòu dào bǎomì. yī huìr, wǒ huì jiě shì shèng xià de bù fēn.

zài èr qiān shí nián sì yuè yī rì nà tiān, nǐ huò zhù hù chéng yuán zài zhè lǐ jū zhù huò zàn zhù ma?

S3. Does someone usually live at this (house/apartment/mobile home), or is this a vacation or seasonal home?

平常有人在这里常住吗（房子，公寓，移动式房屋）？

或者这里是季节性住所或第二住所？

píng cháng yǒu rén zài zhè lǐ cháng zhù ma (fáng zi, gōng yù, yí dòng shì fang wū)? huò zhě zhè lǐ shì jì jié xìng zhù suǒ huò dì èr zhù suǒ?

S4. On April 1, was this unit vacant, or occupied by a different household?

在4月1日，这个住房是空置的还是其他的住户居住？

zài sì yuè yī rì, zhè ge zhù fáng shì kōng zhì de hái shì yǒu qí tā de zhù hù jū zhù?

S5. We need to count people where they live and sleep most of the time.

Please look at list A. It contains examples of people who should not be counted at this place.

Based on these examples, how many people were living or staying in this (house/apartment/mobile home) on April 1?

我们需要在人们居住和睡觉大部分时间的地方统计他们。

请看A单子上需要和不需要在这里被统计的人的例子。

据这些例子，在4月1日有多少人在这个（房子，公寓，移动式房屋）居住或暂住？

wǒ men xū yào zài rén men jū zhù hé shuì jiào dà bù fēn shí jiān de dì fang tǒng jì tā men.
qǐng kàn A dān zi shàng xū yào hé bù xū yào zài zhè lǐ bèi tǒng jì de rén de lì zi.
gēn jù zhè xiē lì zi, zài sì yuè yī rì yǒu duō shao rén zài zhè ge (fāng zi, gōng yù, yí dòng shì fāng wū) jū zhù huò zàn zhù?

-
1. Let's make a list of all those people. Please start with the name of an owner or renter who was living here on April 1. Otherwise, start with any adult living here.

可以告诉我所有的人的名字吗？首先是拥有或租房的人的名字。

如果他们在4月1日住在其他地方，请告诉我这所房子居住的任何一位成年人的名字？

kě yǐ gào su wǒ suǒ yǒu de rén de míng zi ma? shǒu xiān shì yōng yǒu huò zū fáng de rén de míng zi. rú guǒ tā men zài sì yuè yī rì zhù zài qí tā dì fang, qǐng gào su wǒ zhè suǒ fāng zi jū zhù de rèn hé yī wèi chéng nián rén de míng zi?

2. How is (*name*) related to (*person 1*)?

这个人于第一个人是什么关系？

zhè ge rén yǔ dì yī ge rén shì shén me guān xi?

3. Is (*name*) male or female?

这个人的性别是什么？

zhè ge rén de xìng bié shì shén me?

4. What was (*name's*) age of April 1, 2010? What is (*name's*) date of birth?

这个人在2010年4月1日的年龄是什么？出生年月日是什么？

zhè ge rén zài èr qiān shí nián sì yuè yī rì de nián líng shì shén me? chū shēng nián yuè rì shì shén me?

5. Please look at List C. Is (name) of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

请看C单子，这个人是不是南美洲西班牙人，拉丁美洲西班牙人或西班牙后裔吗？

qǐng kàn C dān zi, zhè ge rén shì Nán měi zhōu xī bān yá rén, lā dīng měi zhōu xī bān yá rén huò xī bān yá hòu yì ma?

6. Please look at List D and choose one or more races. For this census, Hispanic origin is not a race. What is (name's) race?

请看D单子，然后选出一个或多个种族。这次的人口普查中，西班牙后裔不是种族类别。这个人的种族是什么？

qǐng kàn D dān zi, rán hòu xuǎn chū yī ge huò duō ge zhǒng zú. zhè cì de rén kǒu pǔ chá zhōng, xī bān yá hòu yì bù shì zhǒng zú lèi bié. zhè ge rén de zhǒng zú shì shén me?

7. Does (name) sometimes live or stay somewhere else for any of these reasons?

这个人是否有时居住或暂住其他地方？

zhè ge rén shì fǒu yǒu shí jū zhù huò zàn zhù qí tā dì fāng?

-
- H1. We do not want to miss any people who might have been staying here on April 1. Were there any additional people that you didn't mention, for example: Babies? Foster children? Any other relatives? Roommates? Any other nonrelatives? How about anyone else staying here on April 1 who had no permanent place to live?

我们不想漏掉任何在4月1日可能在这里居住或暂住的人。有没有别的人呢？例如：婴儿？养子女？其它亲属关系？同住合租人或室友？其它非亲属关系？4月1日时在这里暂住且没有永久居住地的人？

wǒ men bù xiǎng lòu diào rèn hé zài sì yuè yī rì kě néng zài zhè lǐ jū zhù huò zàn zhù de rén. yǒu méi yǒu bié de rén ne? lì rú: yīng ér? yǎng zǐ nǚ? qí tā qīn shǔ guān xi? tóng zhù hé zū rén huò shì yǒu? qí tā fēi qīn shǔ guān xi? sì yuè yī rì shí zài zhè lǐ zàn zhù qiě méi yǒu yǒng jiǔ jū zhù dì de rén?

- H2. Do you or does someone in this household own this (house/apartment/mobile home) with a mortgage or loan, including home equity loans; own it free and clear; or occupy it without having to pay rent?

这个住房是：

属于您或您住户的某个成员通过房屋抵押贷款或房屋净值贷款？

属于您或您住户的某个成员，没有任何债务

租用 或免租金住用

zhè ge zhù fáng shì:

shǔ yú nín huò nín zhù hù de mǒu ge chéng yuán tōng guò fang wū dǐ yá dài kuǎn huò fang wū jìng zhí dài kuǎn?

shǔ yú nín huò nín zhù hù de mǒu ge chéng yuán, méi yǒu rèn hé zhài wù zū yòng huò miǎn zū jīn zhù yòng

H3. What is the address of this unit?

这个住房的地址是什么？

zhè ge zhù fáng de dì zhǐ shì shén me?

R1. What is your name?

请问你的名字是什么？

qǐng wèn nǐ de míng zì shì shén me?

R2. What is your phone number and best time to call?

你的电话是什么以及最方便打电话给你的时间？

nǐ de diàn huà shì shén me yǐ jí zuì fāng biàn dǎ diàn huà gěi nǐ de shí jiān?

11 Appendix C: RESPONDENT DEBRIEFING QUESTIONS

I: CENSUS EXPERIENCE

1. How long have you been in the United States?

你来美国多久了？

nǐ lái Měi guó duō jiǔ le?

IF ARRIVED BEFORE 2001:

2. Did you participate in the last US census? How does this experience compare to your experience in 2000?

你有参加过以前的人口普查吗？比较这次的人口普查与2000年，感觉如何？

nǐ yǒu cān jiā guò yǐ qián de rén kǒu pǔ chá ma? Bǐ jiào zhè cì de rén-kou-pu-cha yu 2000 nian, gan-jue ru he?

3. Have you encountered information about this year's US Census in Chinese language outlets such as newspapers, magazines, on radio or television?

你有没有看到过有关今年的人口普查的广告？例如报纸，杂志，广播，或电视？如果有的话，是在哪里看到的？

nǐ yǒu méi yǒu kàn dào guò yǒu guān jīn nián de rén kǒu pǔ chá de guǎng gào? lì rú bào zhǐ, zá zhì, guǎng bō, huò diàn shì? rú guǒ yǒu de huà, shì zài nǎ lǐ kàn dào de?

4. Have you heard about the census at places such as community centers, churches, or stores?

你有没有在什地方听今年的口普？例如社区中心，教堂，商店吗？

nǐ yǒu méi yǒu zài shén me dì fāng tīng shuō guo jīn nián de rén kǒu pǔ chá ? lì rú shè qū zhōng xīn, jiào táng, shāng diàn ma?

II: VIEWS OF OFFICIAL ACTIVITY

1. What do you think the U.S. Census is for? **Who do you think uses this information, and for what purpose?**

你认为美国人口普查是的目的是什么？你认为谁会使用这些资料？他们的目的是什么？

nǐ rèn wéi rén kǒu pǔ chá shì de mù dì shì shén me? Nǐ rèn wéi shéi huì shi-yong zhei-xie zhi-liao? Tanmen de mu-di shi shenma?

2. Do you remember receiving the census form? Is there any reason why you did not return it?

你有没有收到过人口普查问卷？为什么没有填好寄回呢？

nǐ yǒu méi yǒu shōu dào guò rén kǒu pǔ chá wèn juǎn ? wèi shén me méi yǒu tián hǎo jì huí ne?

III: OTHER SURVEY/INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE

1. Have you ever been surveyed in the United States for other reasons?

你在美国有没有参加过别的（问卷）调查呢？

nǐ zài Měi guó yǒu méi yǒu cān jiā guò bié de (wèn juǎn) diào chá ne?

2. Have you taken part in a census back home? [*add place of origin here*]

你在本国有没有参加过人口普查呢？

nǐ zài běn guó yǒu méi yǒu cān jiā guò rén kǒu pǔ chá ne?

3. What do you think is the purpose of a census in [China / Hong Kong / Taiwan / Macau]? Do you think it has a different objective than the census in the US?

你认为在_____的人口普查的目的是什么？你觉得这个目的和美国的人口普查的目的
一样吗？

nǐ rèn wéi zài _____de rén kǒu pǔ chá de mù dì shì shén me?

IV: CENSUS TECHNICAL PROCESS ISSUES

1. Do you check your mailbox every day? Who usually opens English-language mail in your home?

你每天都看看有没有收到邮件吗？通常是谁打开英文的邮件呢？

nǐ měi tiān dōu kàn kan yǒu méi yǒu shōu dào yóu jiàn ma? tōng cháng shì shéi dǎ kāi yīng wén de yóu jiàn ne?

2. How do you usually find out information about your community and news in general? What newspapers and magazines do you read? What television stations do you usually watch? What radio stations do you usually listen to? Which of these provided information about the census?

你通常是如何得到有关社区的讯息？常看什么报纸或杂志？常看哪些电视台？常听哪些广播电台？哪些有关于人口普查的□□？

nǐ tōng cháng shì rú hé dé dào yǒu guān shè qū de xùn xī? cháng kàn shén me bào zhǐ huò zá zhì? cháng kàn nǎ xiē diàn shì tái? cháng tīng nǎ xiē guǎng bō diàn tái? Na xie you guan-yu ren-kou-pu-cha de guang-gao?

3. Did your children hear about the Census while at school? If so, what did they tell you?

家里的小孩在学校有没有听到有关人口普查的事情呢？他们有没有和你说？

jiā lǐ de xiǎo hái zài xué xiào yǒu méi yǒu tīng dào yǒu guān rén kǒu pǔ chá de shì qing ne? tā men yǒu méi yǒu hé nǐ shuō?

V. INTERVIEW PROCESS AS A COMMUNICATIVE EVENT:

1. Were printed materials in Chinese helpful in the process?

你觉得中文资料有没有起到帮助的作用？

nǐ jué de Zhōng wén zhì liào yǒu méi yǒu qǐ dào bāng zhù de zuò yòng?

2. Was anything confusing about the census questions asked?

你对这些有关人口普查的问题有没有不明白或觉得很复杂的？

nǐ duì zhè xiē yǒu guān rén kǒu pǔ chá de wèn tí yǒu méi yǒu bù míng bai huò jué de hěn fù zá de?

3. Did you feel comfortable with the interpreter? In what ways do you think the interpreter facilitated or otherwise affected the interview process?

你对使用翻译的感觉如何？你觉得使用翻译如何协助或影响访问的过程？

Ni-dui shi-yong fan-yi-de gǎnjué ru-he? Ni jue-de shi-yong fan-yi ru-he xie-zhu huo ying-xiang fangwen-de-guo-chang?

12 Appendix D: Enumerator Debriefing Questions

I. Census Interview Experience:

1. Have you done census interview work before this?
你曾经做过人口普查的工作吗？
2. Have you had experience conducting other types of surveys or interviews? If so, what types?
你曾经做过别的（问卷）调查吗？那些呢？

II. Interactions with Respondents:

1. What do you think was most challenging for you in this process?
你觉得作访问最困难的在哪里？
2. How do you cope with reluctant respondents? When you encounter reluctant respondents, what strategies do you use?
你如何应付不愿意回答的人？当你遇到不愿意回答的人，你有哪些方法？
3. Are interviews with non-native English speakers more challenging? If so, how?
你觉得访问不会英文的人比较困难吗？哪里比较困难？
4. Besides language differences, what issues or problems did you encounter?
撇开语言不通，访问的时候，觉得还有哪些问题呢？比如说 ...

III. Interview Process as a Communicative Event:

If an interpreter was used:

如果有通过翻译:

1. How do you find an interpreter when needed? How do you verify an interpreter's language capabilities?
当你需要翻译的时候，你如何找翻译的人？你如何肯定他的语言能力？
2. What effects did the interpreter have on the interview process?
使用翻译对访问有什么样的影响？
3. Were you satisfied with the interpreters you encountered?
你对遇到过的翻译觉得满意吗？

If Chinese language materials used in interview:

1. How did the use of Chinese language materials affect this interview?

你觉得使用中文资料对访问有什么样的影响？